Caryl Holderbein

CAMPUS STORE
BETHANY BIBLE COLLEGE
800 BETHANY DRIVE
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/systemofchristia0000lean_o4e6

OTHER BOOKS BY LEANDER S. KEYSER

The Philosophy of Christianity

A System of General Ethics
Fourth Edition

A System of Natural Theism
Second Edition

A Manual of Christian Ethics

A Handbook of Christian Psychology

The Conflict of Fundamentalism and Modernism

In the Redeemer's Footsteps (2 volumes)

In the Apostles' Footsteps (2 volumes)

A System of Christian Evidence

LEANDER S. KEYSER, A.M., D.D.

Late Professor Emeritus of Systematic Theology
in Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College,
Springfield, Ohio

✠

Tenth Edition, Revised

THE LUTHERAN LITERARY BOARD
BURLINGTON, IOWA

Copyright:
1922, 1924, 1926, 1930, 1935, 1939, 1942, 1944, 1945, 1948, 1950, 1953
By THE LUTHERAN LITERARY BOARD
Burlington, Iowa

PREFATORY NOTES

Primarily this work is intended for a textbook in Bible schools, colleges and theological seminaries. For this reason the material has been arranged in as clear, orderly and logical a form as possible, and the captions are set out somewhat boldly on the pages in various fonts of type. Thus, both teacher and student will find it convenient for use; the former in assigning lessons and formulating questions; the latter in making his preparation for the classroom. The orderly disposition of the various topics will also meet the needs of the inquiring general reader.

Candor and concern alike compel us to add that a pressing need exists today for teachers of Christian Evidence in our colleges, seminaries and Bible schools to ground their students well in the faith of the Gospel. There is much unbelief, more or less outspoken and aggressive, in the world today. No less is it true that much rationalism, negative Biblical criticism and harmful speculative science are now prevalent in some churches

and their schools, as well as in some of the schools of the State. The situation demands firmly established believers and stalwart defenders of the faith.

Present-day Apologetics cannot confine their attention to infidelity and deism, as did the defense of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and a large part of the nineteenth century; it must also meet the rationalism and negative Biblical criticism of the times, and no less the constant assaults that come from the speculative side of science and philosophy. The modern defender of the faith, therefore, has no light task on his hands.

The author has sincerely tried to avoid epithets. Indeed, he has said many kind things about the skeptic, and has done his best to treat him fairly. He takes no pleasure in impugning the motives of opponents, in calling them harsh names, nor in trying to discredit their intelligence and scholarship. His earnest purpose has been to establish the believer more firmly in the Christian faith, and, if possible, to lead the doubter to an acceptance of the blessings, joys and assurances of Biblical Christianity.

Our reverend author always was so very grateful for the marked degree of divine favor that has rested upon this handbook of Christian Evidence. It is gratifying to note that an evangelical book of this kind has run into the tenth edition. The treatise has been used in nearly one hundred institutions of learning as a textbook; it has also had a gratifying general circulation. A few timely revisions of the previous text have been made for the present edition. We would ask the

reader to note the extensive list of apologetic works that have been issued throughout the years and up to the very date of the issue of this volume. And yet a reputed scholar of the modernistic school recently published a book in which he speaks of "the bankruptcy of Apologetics!" Does that evince up-to-date scholarship? Does it display an open mind?

THE PUBLISHERS.

A GENERAL OUTLINE OF THE SYSTEM

Part I

GENERAL NOTES AND PRINCIPLES

Part II

THE BIBLE A SPECIAL DIVINE REVELATION

Part III

CHRISTIAN THEISM AND OPPOSING THEORIES

Part IV

THE DOUBTER AND HIS DIFFICULTIES

Part V

THE FAILURE OF INFIDELITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I
GENERAL NOTES AND PRINCIPLES

CHAPTER I

I. DEFINITION 21
1. Of Christian Evidence 21
2. Of Christian Apologetics 21
3. Of Apology and Apologetics 21
4. Of an Apology and an Apologetic 22
5. Use of the Word "Evidence" 22
6. Of Polemics 23
7. Of Controversy 23
8. Of Religion 23
9. Of the Christian Religion 23
II. CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS AS APOLOGISTS 24
1. Biblical Basis 24
2. Rational Grounds 25
(1) Use and Value of Human Reason... 25
(2) Limits of Human Reason..... 27

CHAPTER II

III. HOW TO TREAT DOUBTERS..... 33
1. Right Ways 33
(1) Treat them kindly..... 33
(2) Convince them by sound reason.... 33
(3) Aim to win them to the truth..... 34
(4) Pray earnestly for them..... 34
2. Wrong Ways 34
(1) Do not call them dishonest..... 34
(2) Do not treat them with contempt.. 35
(3) Do not threaten them..... 35

(4) Do not argue merely to gain a victory 36
(5) Do not think you can convert them by reason 36
IV. VARIOUS KINDS OF DOUBTERS..... 37
1. Honest Doubters 37
2. Skeptics 38
3. Infidels 38
4. Free-Thinkers 38
5. Secularists 38
6. Cavillers 39
7. Lampooners 39
8. Rationalists 40
9. Liberalists and Latitudinarians..... 41

CHAPTER III

V. CHIEF CAUSES OF DOUBT..... 42
1. Real Intellectual Difficulties..... 42
2. Moral Causes 42
3. Lack of Information..... 43
4. Absence of the Spiritual Mind..... 44
5. Inconsistent Professing Christians..... 45

CHAPTER IV

VI. HISTORICAL SKETCH OF APOLOGETICS 47
1. The Apologetic Period..... 47
(1) Apologists 47
(2) Opponents 47
(3) General Character 47
(4) Apologists and Opponents in Conflict 48
2. The Polemical Period..... 49
(1) The Apostles' Creed 50
(2) The Nicene Creed..... 51

(3) The Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed 51
(4) The Athanasian Creed..... 51
3. The Medieval Period..... 51
(1) Defenders of Orthodox Christianity 51
(2) The Chief Heretic..... 52
4. The Modern Period..... 52
(1) English Deism 52
(2) French Encyclopedism 53
(3) German Rationalism 54
(4) Popular Infidelity 56
(5) Modernism 58

CHAPTER V

VII. METHODOLOGY 62
1. Definition 62
2. Methodology of the Present Work..... 62
(1) Note on the General Outline..... 62
(2) The Main Proposition in Apologetics 62
(3) Other Methods Considered..... 64
(4) Internal and External Evidences.... 67
(5) Another Classification 67

Part II

THE BIBLE A SPECIAL DIVINE REVELATION

CHAPTER VI

I. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS 69
1. The Probability of a Special Revelation 69
2. The Possibility of such a Revelation.... 70
3. The Need of such a Revelation..... 70
4. Why God made a Book..... 71
5. No Rational Substitute for Christianity.. 72

6. Rejection of Christianity Means Nescience 72
7. Some Definitions 73
(1) Genuineness 74
(2) Authenticity and Credibility..... 74
(3) Integrity 74
(4) Biblical Proofs Moral, not Demonstrative 74
(5) Biblical Proofs Cumulative..... 74
(6) Internal Proofs 75
(7) External Proofs 75
(8) The Terms Orthodox, Conservative, etc. 75

CHAPTER VII

II. INTERNAL PROOFS OF THE DIVINE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE..... 77
1. Its Profound and Rational Doctrines.... 77
(1) The Doctrine of God..... 77
(2) The Doctrine of Man..... 79
(3) The Doctrine of Salvation..... 79
2. The Purity of its Ethics..... 80
3. The Unity and Consistency of its Teaching 83
4. Its Historical Character..... 84
5. The Soberness of its Teaching..... 85
6. The All-Sidedness of its Teaching..... 85
7. Its Relevancy to Human Needs..... 87
(1) It satisfies man's longing for God.. 87
(2) It complements man's conscious weakness 87
(3) It gives positive assurance of truth.. 88

(4) It affords comfort in trial..... 89
(5) It promises the solution of all problems 90
(6) It meets the desire to be right with God 90
(7) It fills the desire for inner purity.. 92
(8) It cancels the fear of death..... 92
(9) It fits into man's complex psychology 94

CHAPTER VIII

II. INTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*)..... 96
8. The Wonderful Person of the Bible—Jesus Christ 96
(1) Crucial Nature of this Thesis..... 96
(2) Christ's Marvelous Claims..... 97
(3) His Ethical Purity..... 98
(4) His Spiritual Insight..... 98
(5) His Calmness, Courage and Patience 99
(6) Tributes of Skeptics..... 99
(7) Tributes of Great Believers.....101
9. The Apostles and Evangelists as Witnesses 102
(1) They were Sincere.....102
(2) They were Sober, not Credulous...103
(3) They were Competent.....104
(4) They were without Worldly Power and Prestige 106

CHAPTER IX

II. INTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).....108
9. The Apostles and Evangelists as Witnesses (*continued*) 108

(5) Their Witness to the Resurrection of Christ 108
a. Crucial nature of this doctrine.....108
b. Various human theories.....108
(a) The swoon theory; (b) The vision theory; (c) The legend theory; (d) The falsehood theory; (e) Stolen by His enemies; (f) Stolen by His disciples.
c. Positive evidences 112
(a) Many Christophanies 112
(b) They ceased after a time.....112
(c) Change wrought in the disciples 113
(d) Final assurance that Christ was the Messiah 113
(e) Variant details an added proof..114
(f) Proof of the soul's immortality 114
(g) Character of the resurrection body 115

CHAPTER X

II. INTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).....117
10. The Conversion of Paul.....117
(1) Its Importance 117
(2) Improbability of His Conversion...118
(3) The Reality of His Conversion....118
(4) His Vital Doctrines.....119
11. Frankness of Biblical Writers.....120
12. Fulfillment of Prophecy.....122
13. Biblical Claim to Inspiration.....125
(1) Definition of divine inspiration.....125

(2) What the Bible claims for itself.....126
(3) The Biblical canon.....132

CHAPTER XI

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS OF THE DIVINE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE..134
1. The Proof from Experience.....134
(1) A Distinction 134
(2) Definition of Christian Experience..134
(3) Direct Assurance from the Bible....135
(4) The Witness of the Spirit.....136
(5) Contents of Religious Assurance....137
(6) Positive Assurance and Negation..141
(7) Spiritual and Sense Experience.....141
(8) The Great "Cloud of Witnesses"...142
(9) Christian Experience Unique.....142
(10) Christian Experience no Delusion..143

CHAPTER XII

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).....144
2. Christianity's Salutary Influence.....146
(1) Individual Examples 146
(2) Its Elevating Influence.....146
(3) Reasons for Uplifting Effects.....147
(4) Why Christianity does not Cure all Ills 148
(5) Wrongs done in Name of Religion..148
3. Proofs from History.....150
(1) Ancient Manuscripts 150
a. Codex Sinaiticus; b. Codex Vaticanus; c. Codex Alexandrinus; d. Codex Ephraemi; e. Many others.

(2) Helps in Determining the Text....153
a. The Targums; b. The Talmud; c. The Septuagint.
(3) Early Translations 154
(4) Jewish and Christian Care of Sacred Writings 154
(5) An Early Syriac Version.....155
(6) Testimony of Apostolic and Church Fathers 155
(7) Witness of Early Secular Writers..159

CHAPTER XIII

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).....161
4. Proofs from Archeology.....161
(1) Character and Abundance of Evidence 161
(2) Specific Instances 161
a. Creation of the universe; b. The Traditions of the Deluge; c. The Code of Hammurabi; d. The Tell el Amarna Tablets; e. The City of Pithom; f. Hittites; g. New Testament Confirmations h. Early Civilization; i. Early Religions.

CHAPTER XIV

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).....169
5. Proofs from Biblical Criticism.....169
(1) Definitions 169
a. Of Lower Biblical Criticism.....169
b. Of Higher Biblical Criticism.....169
(2) Legitimate Biblical Criticism.....170
(3) Criticism and Scholarship.....170

(4) The Mediating Criticism.....171
(5) Reference to the Bibliography.....174
6. Proofs from the Principle of Causality...175
7. Proofs from the Integrity of the Bible..177
8. Proofs from Genuineness.....178
(1) Definition and Principle.....178
(2) Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch 178
(3) Genuineness of Other Books.....180

CHAPTER XV

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).....182
9. Proofs from Physical Science.....182
(1) Love of Science.....182
(2) The Bible and the Scientific Realm..182
(3) No Conflict between the Bible and Science 183
(4) Scientific Theories Change.....184
10. Proofs from the Biblical World-View..185
(1) Definition of World-View.....185
(2) The Biblical Doctrine of God.....186
(3) The Ethical and Spiritual Viewpoint 187
(4) The Biblical Philosophy.....187

Part III

CHRISTIAN THEISM AND OPPOSING THEORIES

CHAPTER XVI

I. REASONS FOR THIS THESIS.....189
II. CHRISTIAN THEISM 190
1. Definitions 190

(1) Of Theism 190
(2) Of Natural Theism.....190
(3) Of Christian Theism.....190
2. Biblical Proofs of the Divine Existence..190
3. Corroborative Proofs of the Divine Existence 192
(1) The General Argument.....192
(2) The Cosmological Argument.....192
(3) The Teleological Argument.....195
(4) The Moral Argument.....194
(5) The Esthetic Argument.....195
(6) The Ontological Argument.....196

CHAPTER XVII

III. ANTI-CHRISTIAN THEORIES 198
1. Atheism and Materialism.....198
2. Idealism 199
3. Deism 200
4. Pantheism 201
5. Positivism 203

CHAPTER XVIII

III. ANTI-CHRISTIAN THEORIES (*contin'd*)..206
6. Naturalistic Evolution 206
7. Theistic Evolution 207
(1) No Proof of Spontaneous Generation 209
(2) No Proof of Transmutation of Species 210
(3) Not Taught in the Bible.....210
(4) Not in Evidence Today.....210
(5) The Theory Leads to Infidelity.....211

(6) It Tends to Loose Views of the Bible 213
8. Monism 214
9. Agnosticism 215
10. The Doctrine of a Finite God..... 216
11. Pluralism 217
(1) Definition; (2) Its Advocates; (3) Its Basis; (4) Its Error as a Philosophy.
12. Pessimism 219
(1) Definition; (2) Specimen Expressions; (3) Errors; (4) Contrast of Christian Optimism.

Part IV
THE DOUBTER AND HIS DIFFICULTIES
CHAPTER XIX

I. HIS DISPOSITION OF MIND..... 222
1. He should be Sincere..... 222
2. He should never Resort to Ridicule..... 222
3. He should Banish Pride of Opinion..... 222
4. He should not Think Christians Ignorant 223
5. No Mark of Smartness to Doubt..... 223
6. Doubt *per se* not a Good Thing..... 223
II. THE DOUBTER'S DIFFICULTIES..... 224
1. General Remarks 224
2. The Narrative of Creation..... 225
3. The Creation of Man and Woman..... 229
4. Man's Fall into Sin..... 232
5. The History of Cain..... 234
6. The Noachian Deluge..... 235
7. Israel's Crossing the Red Sea..... 235

CHAPTER XX

II. THE DOUBTER'S DIFFICULTIES (*cont.*)..236
8. God's Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart...237
9. The Slaughter of the Canaanites.....237
10. Jonah and the Whale.....239
11. The Imprecatory Psalms.....240
12. Apparent Discrepancies in the Bible....241
13. Why God Permits Sin and Suffering....241
14. Miracles in General.....242
15. Why the Bible is not Perfectly Plain...245

Part V

THE FAILURE OF INFIDELITY

CHAPTER XXI

I. PERTINENT OBSERVATIONS 247
1. Infidelity Aggressive and Critical.....247
2. It must be Asked to make Good.....247
II. ACHIEVEMENTS OF INFIDELS.....248
1. In the Field of Literature.....248
2. In the Field of Science and Invention..250
III. THE WEAKNESS OF INFIDELITY.....252
1. It Builds no Enduring Institutions.....252
2. It Creates no Helpful Literature.....252
3. It has Produced no Great Works of Art.253
4. It Raises Doubts but Solves no Problems..253
5. Its Doctrine of Man One-sided.....254
6. It Lacks Moral Dynamic.....255
7. It Saps the Foundations of Morality....255
8. A Parallel and a Contrast.....256
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....258
A BOOK LIST UP TO DATE.....280
INDEX 284

A System of Christian Evidence

Part I

GENERAL NOTES AND PRINCIPLES

CHAPTER I

I. DEFINITION.

1. Of Christian Evidence.

Christian Evidence is the scientific proof of the divine authority of the Christian religion.

2. Of Christian Apologetics.

Christian Apologetics is the scientific vindication of the divine authority of the Christian religion.

3. Of Apology and Apologetics.

These words are derived from the Greek word *apologia* (*apo* and *logia*), meaning a *discourse in favor of* . . . In popular language the word "apology" usually means an excuse for some offense or mistake, and the word "apologetic," used as an adjective, means an undignified or servile manner."[1] However in scientific

[1] Garvie: *A Handbook of Christian Apologetics*, p. 2.

usage these words bear no such meaning, but signify a systematic and closely reasoned vindication.

4. Of an Apology and an Apologetic.

An *Apology*, in the theological sense, is a defense against a special attack on the Bible or a part of the Bible, or a vindication of some phase of the Christian religion.

An *Apologetic* is an attempt to develop a complete system of proof in favor of Christianity.

The term, *Christian Apologetics*, means the same thing. Usually the plural form of the word is employed, although, when the article is used, it is proper to say *an Apologetic;* without the article scholars generally say *Apologetics.*

Examples of the different uses of the terms are as follows: Justin Martyr's two *Apologies* and Bishop Watson's *Apology* are partial defenses; Ebrard's *Christian Apologetics* and Garvie's *Handbook* of *Christian Apologetics* aim to furnish as complete and systematic treatises as possible.[2]

5. Use of the Word "Evidence."

In the title of this work we use the term "Evidence" rather than "Apologetics." Our reasons are as follows:

(1) *Evidence* carries a more positive meaning: (2) It may be used without explanation to include both

[2] The distinction between an Apology and Apologetics is not always as sharply drawn as it is here. Some writers use the terms in a more elastic way.

proof and defense; (3) It is understood by all, needing no explanation, because it is never used in the bad sense.

In the body of this work, however, we shall often use the word *Apology* and its derivatives, but always in the scientific sense.[3]

6. Of Polemics.

Polemics is contention, not with infidels outside of the Christian Church, but with heretics within the Church. The term may be used in both a good and a bad sense. In the good sense it means contending seriously and honestly for the truth. In the bad sense it means over-fondness for discussion, accompanied with more or less hectic feeling.

7. Of Controversy.

Controversy means vigorous debate. This word is sometimes used in a good sense, but, as a rule it signifies discussion in a more or less belligerent spirit; hence the controversial temper is not likely to be judicial and fair.

8. Of Religion.

Religion (perhaps from *religio*, *religare*, to tie back or fasten) is man's relation to the supernatural, involving communion and service.

9. Of the Christian Religion.

The Christian religion is man's relation to God through the mediation of Jesus Christ, according to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

[3] Cf. Rishell: *The Foundations of the Christian Faith*, pp. 12, 13.

II. CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS AS APOLOGISTS[4]

1. Biblical Basis.

Christian scholars should be able to defend their religion because the Bible itself contains a marked *apologetic element*. God, Christ and the inspired writers did not fail to defend the truth when it was opposed and assaulted, nor did they permit sin and error to go unrebuked.

The book of *Job* is a vindication of God's ways to men, and in the last chapter Jehovah Himself takes a part in the debate and brings it to a close. Many of the *Psalms* give cogent reasons for righteousness and obedience (1, 2, 14, 19, 33, 119). Psalm 119 contains 176 verses in all but two of which there is some strong statement in favor of God's word, laws, statutes, judgments, testimonies.

In one place *God Himself condescends* to reason with men: "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord" (Isa. 1:18). In another He challenges His People: "Produce your cause, saith Jehovah: bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob" (Isa. 41:21).

Christ often defended Himself and His teaching (Matt. 12:24-37; John 5:19-47; 7:15-24; 8:30-32, 46, 47). Note the first passage cited: Christ was accused of casting out devils through Beelzebub; did He sit meekly and quiescently by without defending Himself and denying the false allegation? He did not.

Paul frequently reasoned with the Jews and others

---

[4] Cf. The Author: *Contending for the Faith*, chap. I.

(Acts 17:2; 18:4; 19; 24:25; 1 Thess. 5:21). Note his classical defense of himself and his doctrines before Agrippa; also his powerful apologetical discourse on Mars Hill in Athens (Acts 16). The Epistles to the Romans and Galatians are apologies in favor of justification by faith and salvation by grace against Jewish legalism. *James* argues strongly for good works as the fruit of faith; *St. John* for love as the actuating principle of life.

Note *two classical passages* enjoining the duty of upholding the faith:

"But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts; and be ready always to give *an answer* to every man that asketh you a *reason* for the hope that is in you with meekness and fear" (1 Pet. 3:15). The Greek word for "*answer*" in this passage is *apologian*, the accusative case of *apologia.*

"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write, and exhort you to *contend earnestly* for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3).

Thus there is good Biblical ground for Christians to be earnest defenders of the truth.[5]

2. Rational Grounds.

(1) *Use and value of human reason.*

a. Men cannot believe what seems to them to be incredible; therefore, the rational grounds of faith

[5] Cf. C. F. Scott: *The Apologetic Element in the New Testament;* Andrew D. Heffern: *Apology and Polemic in the New Testament* (1922).

should be shown. If possible, the Christian should prove that it is not unreasonable to accept the Bible as God's Word and to believe in Jesus Christ as the world's Redeemer.

b. Reason is a God-given faculty, being an innate part of man's psychical constitution; therefore, it should be used in religion as well as elsewhere.

c. Abstract truth is not very strong *per se;* therefore, it must become incarnated in human champions. Some men say loftily: "Do not be solicitous about the truth; the truth will take care of itself!" If that is correct, why does anyone ever take the trouble to defend and promote the truth? Why did the Son of God come into the world if it was not to make divine truth plain and appealing to men's apprehension? Why did the apostles reason, preach, teach, sacrifice and even die, if it was not to uphold and disseminate the truth? Ah! the saying, "Truth will take care of itself," is the motto of laziness and apathy.

d. Some men may be led to Christ by reason, just as others may be led by persuasion or kindly treatment. A gracious word or deed will appeal most forcibly to some persons; a reasoned process to others. Why not employ both methods as the different cases may require? Paul declared that he became "all things to all men, if by all means he might win some."

e. Few men can be led to Christ by mere dogmatism and assertion. They resent such a method. They are much more likely to be amenable to reason, especially if they are thoughtful and educated men.

f. If Christians do not defend their religion, skep-

tics will be likely to think they cannot. Will not that encourage them to continue in their unbelief?

g. If opponents employ reason and scholarship, Christians must be able to meet and match them on their own ground. Not all Christians can be thus equipped, but surely some men should be trained to meet scholarly liberalists and unbelievers.

h. Many difficulties may really be removed by reason. If Christians can succeed in removing them, will not that dispose skeptics to go to Christ in prayer and faith to find assurance of truth and salvation? Dr. Francis L. Patton said: "Christianity will be denied a hearing in the court of feeling, once she has been nonsuited at the bar of reason." [6] The conclusion is that, while Christians should not be too much engaged in discussion, they should be able to produce good reasons for their faith when occasion requires. The Christian Apologist has a divine vocation just as has every other useful man.[7]

(2) *Limits of human reason.*

There is, however, another side to this question which must be carefully considered. Too much stress and reliance should not be placed on rational processes, and that for the following reasons:

a. There are *many problems* that mere human intelligence cannot solve. Here are some of them: What is matter? What is mind? How are they correlated in the human brain? What is the origin of matter? How

[6] *Biblical and Theological Studies* (by Princeton Professors), p. 24.

[7] See Rishell: *The Foundations of the Christian Faith*, pp. 15, 16.

did mind originate? How is self-consciousness possible? How can the will be free? How can the will determine itself?

The fact is, we are surrounded on every hand by insoluble mysteries. Lord Kelvin admitted that he did not know what electricity and magnetism are.[8]

Thomas A. Huxley, one of the outstanding agnostics of a past generation, averred that there are no mysteries in the Christian creed that would lead one, on *a priori* ground, to reject its teaching. Then he added: "The mysteries of the church are like child's play compared with the mysteries of nature. The doctrine of the Trinity is not more puzzling than the necessary antinomies of physical speculation. The virgin procreation and resuscitation from apparent death are ordinary phenomena for the naturalist." [9]

Edison once said that, although he had been studying and experimenting with electricity for many years and had invented many useful contrivances, yet he did not know whether it was a substance or only a force.

In view of these facts, men should not expect to solve all the problems of religion by a mere *rational* process.

b. The *heathen have had unaided human reason throughout all history;* have the results been satisfactory? Not one heathen nation has been able, by its

---

[8] Russel: *Lord Kelvin, His Life and Work*, p. 90.

[9] Quoted from James Orr: *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, pp. 221, 222.

unaided efforts, to rise into monotheism. In philosophy how hazy was the teaching of the best Greek and Roman philosophers on the primary questions of God, origins, ethics, free will, sin, salvation and immortality! Socrates *hoped* that the soul was immortal. Plato *hoped* that the gods would forgive sin, but could not be sure that they either could or should. Moreover, many of the human philosophies differ so fundamentally that they are mutually destructive. If Democritus was right, Plato was basically wrong, and *vice versa.* Spinoza's philosophy, if true, would undermine the very foundations of Kant's system.

c. Reason is not above divine revelation. If it were, there would be no need for the latter, and God might as well separate Himself from the world. The failure of English Deism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is a historical proof of the inefficiency of unaided human reason. The same may be said of French atheism and German rationalism.

d. Reason should *not be estimated above faith.* In that case all people would want to decide everything by reason, and there would be no room left for the exercise of faith. Yet the faith faculty is an innate part of human psychology. Everyone has to "walk by faith" through a large part of his life. The earliest acts of a little child are not acts of reason, but of faith, which seems to be instinctive and certainly is necessary to the child's existence.

Faith is requisite in all human intercourse. Without it society could not exist, trade could not flourish, governments could not arise and endure. The man who

demands only reason in religion should remember how often he must exercise faith in order to live at all.

In human society faith is a good thing, and wherever it can be safely exercised, that fact connotes a normal condition of affairs; whereas where doubt and suspicion prevail in human relations, there is evidently a disturbance of the normal order. Mutual confidence is a good thing *per se*. It is only when something abnormal has entered into human relationships that distrust arises.

e. It is a mistake to think that Christian faith is *blind credulity*, as unbelievers constantly allege. For three reasons, at least, that cannot be true:

(a) Christian faith is begotten in the human heart by the Holy Spirit, for Paul says (Eph. 2:8), "It is the gift of God." It is not probable that the Holy Spirit would make a man credulous and at the same time give him a joyous assurance of pardon, salvation and truth.

(b) The Bible itself warns men against being too ready to believe, and enjoins on them the exercise of discrimination. Christ said, "Take heed how ye hear and what ye hear" (Mark 4:24; Luke 8:18). Also: "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves" (Matt. 7:15).

Note Paul's injunction: "Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good" (1 Thess. 5:21). Again: "For God gave us, not a spirit of fearfulness, but of power and love and soberness" (2 Tim. 1:7). St. John

says: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John 4:1). Hear Paul's ringing defense: "I am not mad, most noble Festus; but speak forth the words of truth and soberness" (Acts 26:25). Thus the Bible itself cautions us against being gullible.

(c) *Many men and women of great learning have faith in Christ and the Bible.* It is unreasonable to believe that they have been stricken with superstition and blind credulity. They would hardly be believers if they did not have good reasons for their faith.

Reason and Christian faith should never be regarded as antagonistic. Sometimes when reason cannot solve its problems, faith can, and this is especially true in the sphere of religion, as millions of people in the history of the world have testified and as many will testify today. Since God has given to men both faculties, that of faith and that of reason, it is rational to believe that He is pleased with the proper use of both of them, each in its appointed way.

f. *Human reason cannot give the final word of assurance in matters of religion.* Experience proves this; for, however expert the Christian apologist may be, he cannot convert men by reason. He may be able to lead them to go to Christ in repentance and faith, but then the Holy Spirit must give the assurance of truth, pardon and salvation. No one should suppose that reason can usurp the place and function of the Holy Spirit.

g. Let us remember this fact: Human reason can-

not *prove* the Christian religion to be true. It can only show it to be *more reasonable than unbelief*. Then it must be *experienced* in order that it may be known to be true.

h. A question may be asked at this point. Why cannot reason say the final word in religion? That is an opposite question; let us try to answer it.

No doubt God knew that, if men could solve all their problems by mere human reason, they would *become proud and would neglect their Maker*. That surely would not have been conducive to their best moral and spiritual welfare. How much harm pride and vainglory do in the world! Much of our trouble may be traced more or less directly to them. How much better it is for people to be humble! How much more pleasant and cordial are their associations! When you note how rationalists strut and plume themselves on their superior learning, and how they scoff at other people whom they accuse of lack of "scholarship," you can see clearly the baleful effects of human pride. Christ said truly: "Whosoever exalteth himself shall be humbled; and whosoever humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Matt. 32:12).[10]

---

[10] Cf. A discriminating discussion on the function of reason in religion in Heinrich Schmid: *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (English Translation), pp. 29-38.

CHAPTER II

III. HOW TO TREAT DOUBTERS.[1]

1. Right Ways.

(1) *Treat them kindly.* "If you would win some, you must be *winsome*." The Christian simply defeats what should be his real purpose, when he stirs ill will in the mind of the doubter.

(2) If you can, *convince them by sound reason.* Perhaps you may thus remove some of their intellectual difficulties. There are doubters who in their hearts would prefer to believe; for they know that skepticism gives no peace to the heart and solves no problems for the intellect.

More than one skeptic has made this confession to a believer: "I would do anything in my power if I could believe and feel as you do!"

Then why should we not try to help the doubter by removing as many obstacles as possible from his pathway, so that he may be led to go to Christ Himself for conversion. Who knows but that some of us may have

[1] In this connection the author desires to recommend the following works: C. D. Darling: *Doubters and Their Doubts;* H. C. Trumbull: *How to Deal with Doubts and Doubters;* David Nelson: *The Cause and Cure of Infidelity.*

divine vocation to win doubters in this way? Only we must be careful not to usurp the office of the Holy Spirit, who alone can regenerate the soul and give assurance of truth.

(3) Let your dominant motive be to *win them to the truth.* Christians should keep their motives pure. Argument for its own sake is never profitable. But if the purpose is to win men to Christ, then it may be helpful to reason with them.

(4) *Pray earnestly for doubters.* What they really need is conversion. By prayer you will send the Holy Spirit into their hearts and consciences, and He may bring them to a saving knowledge of Christ. Prayer for them will also help the believer to love his skeptical acquaintances, and this will lead him to work for their salvation and to treat them with kindly consideration.

2. Wrong Ways.

(1) *Do not call them dishonest.*

There are several reasons for this advice. a. In many cases you cannot know for a certainty that they are dishonest; therefore, to accuse them of it would be wrong. b. Christians who have never had any real doubts are scarcely in a mental and spiritual condition to sympathize with, and pronounce judgment on, those who are troubled with doubt. It is much better not to judge their motives. There are skeptics who have real intellectual difficulties. c. Even if doubters were dishonest, to accuse them of dishonesty would only

anger them; then there would be no hope of doing them service. The right kind of treatment might win them to a more unbiased frame of mind.

(2) *Do not treat them with contempt.*

That is not the Christian way; nor will it win them to a more favorable consideration of Christian truth. Fair and respectful treatment of skeptics will do much to remove their objections to Christianity. They read church history, and find that so often professed Christians maltreated and persecuted their opponents, and for this reason they suspect that all believers even today have the same spirit of contumely and hatred.

(3) *Do not threaten them.*

They will resent such treatment. To quote the minatory passages of Scripture at them while they are in the skeptical frame of mind will do no good, because they question the very authority you are citing. Their reply will invariably be: "Prove to us first that the Scriptures are true; then your quotations will have point and force."

The only way in which Biblical quotations might be effective would be to show that they are rational and salutary; that Bible teaching is always on the right and reasonable side. For example, if the skeptic declares that he believes in true morality, you ought to be able to show him that the Bible inculcates the deepest, highest and most inherent ethical principles, like this, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right

spirit within me"; or this: "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of Thy throne, O God."

Take another example: If the skeptic points to some passage of Scripture which indicates God's severity toward sinners, as in the Noachian deluge or the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the apologist can cite many passages which prove Him to be merciful and kind, full of compassion, ever ready to forgive all who repent of their sins and turn to righteousness.

As examples, one might cite the following: Isa. 1:18; Ezek. 33:11; Ps. 103:10-14; 130:7; 2 Pet. 3:9; 1 John 1:9; Rom. 11:22. It should also be remembered that, according to the Bible, God never is said to punish people except for their sins.

(4) *Do not argue with skeptics merely to gain a polemical victory.*

That is a mark of worldly ambition and leads to unnecessary and heated controversy. The Christian should keep his motives unsullied.

(5) *Do not think you can convert the skeptic by reason.*

That is the special function of the Holy Spirit. Some people may be *helped* by reason, just as others may be helped by kindness and persuasion; but in no case can human instrumentalities produce regeneration and the inner assurance of truth and salvation. By being all things to all men, you may be able to lead some of them to Christ, who alone, by the Holy Spirit, through the Word of God, can convert the soul.

IV. VARIOUS KINDS OF DOUBTERS.

1. Honest Doubters.

Honest doubters are those *who have real intellectual difficulties*, and are willing to have them resolved. They do not love doubt for its own sake. As a rule, the thoroughly honest doubter will be converted sooner or later, because:

(1) God will not forsake an earnest inquirer, but will come to him by His providence and spirit in such a way as to lead him into the light.

(2) The thoroughly honest doubter will be willing to investigate in all reasonable ways. Perhaps for a time he will try to solve his problems by pure intellection; but when he finds, *as he will*, that this method leads to no definite results, he will investigate in other ways that are recommended to him. The Bible points out the way of assurance (John 7:16, 17): "Jesus therefore answered them, and said, My teaching is not Mine, but His that sent Me. If any man is *willing to do His will*, he shall *know* of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from Myself."

And what is God's will in this particular connection? It is that men should pray for light, should repent of their sins, should be willing to believe on Christ if He proves Himself to be the world's Redeemer. Here is a method of research for the truth that the honest doubter will not decline to follow. When he sees, too, that this method is recommended by many people who bear testimony to its efficacy in their own experience,

he will not refuse to enter the spiritual laboratory in his search for truth.

2. Skeptics.

Strictly speaking, skeptics are *mere doubters*. In popular estimation, however, the word skeptic has come to mean one who is more or less aggressive in his opposition to Christianity.[2]

3. Infidels.

Infidels are *avowed unbelievers*. There are various types of infidels, some being deists, some theists, some pantheists, some atheists, and some agnostics. All persons who reject the Bible and the Christian system are called infidels.

4. Free-Thinkers.

Free-thinkers are those *who claim the right to think for themselves*. Of course, most men, in the strict sense, make the same claim; few people would care to admit that they allow others to do their thinking for them. In the popular mind, however, the so-called *free-thinkers* are practically the same as infidels.

5. Secularists.

This term stands for a class of unbelievers *who profess to care only for the present life*, and who say, "Let the future take care of itself." One of these men declared in a public address that his class of thinkers

---

[2] An extreme skeptic is sometimes called a Pyrrhonist, after Pyrrho, the founder of a school of skeptics in Greece about 376-270 B. C. He taught that all perceptions are of doubtful validity. Thus we see how ancient skepticism is.

"do not deal much in futures." A noted infidel of the nineteenth century made the boast that he had all he could do to take care of one world at one time; therefore, he would take care of the present world, and let the future take care of itself. He was wrong, however, in thinking that all men are afflicted with the same mental impotency as himself.

Unbelievers today do not like to be called "infidels," but prefer to be known as "Secularists" and "Rationalists." They seem to think that the term "infidel" carries with it a good deal of *opprobrium.*

6. Cavillers.

This term is used to designate those *who haggle about small matters.* They are also called carpers. As a rule, they hunt for unimportant historical and other difficulties in the Bible (as, for example, where Cain got his wife), while they fail to consider the great and comprehensive philosophy, world-view, ethical and spiritual teaching, and the gracious plan of redemption set forth in the Holy Scriptures. The person who will look at the doctrines of the Bible in a large way, from the creation of the universe to the destiny prepared for man, cannot be a caviller.

7. Lampooners.

This term designates those *who use ridicule rather than argument.* Other terms that mean practically the same thing are flouters, jibers, jeerers. These terms connote a certain degree of coarseness and ribaldry.

Deriders and satirists also resort to ridicule, but it is of a more refined and acute kind.[3]

8. Rationalists.

This class makes *human reason the final norm of judgment*. As a rule they mean that reason is either above or against the Bible, or both. They also mean *their own reason*, not that of those who differ with them. Their contentions seem to assume that Christian believers do not and cannot employ rational processes. Reason is their idol; they leave no room for faith and the Bible.

There are *two classes* of rationalists. The term originally meant those who do not wholly reject the Bible, but accept only those parts of it that are supposed to agree with reason. Many of the Biblical critics (see Chapter IV) are rationalists of this school.

The other class of rationalists are outright infidels, simply calling themselves by a different name than the historical one. Once they preferred to be called "Secularists" (see Section 5 above), but now they call themselves Rationalists because they profess to be guided

---

[3] There are infidel publications in New York City and the State of Kansas at the present time which are given over to the method of derision, calling Christian people all kinds of hard names. One magazine, for example, selects as its motto, "Make the world unsafe for hypocrisy," and then ridicules all Christians as imposters and "fakes." Christians should not imitate these methods.

only by human reason,[4] while all who differ from them are incapable of using that faculty in an intelligent and unbiased way. To this school belongs the "Rationalist Press Association" of Great Britain, which has many followers and publishes an extensive literature, all of which attacks the Christian faith. The "rationalism and materialistic monism" of England are "professedly based on Darwinism." [5] There are also "Rationalist Societies" (so named by themselves) in various cities of the United States whose object is to conduct a campaign against the Christian Church.

9. Liberalists and Latitudinarians.

These terms designate those *who have some degree of Christian belief, but reject the orthodox view* of the Bible and of the Christian system. Of course, there are various shades and degrees of liberalism, some of its advocates accepting more and some less of the evangelical system. While they call themselves "liberal," because they think themselves unfettered in their thinking, they are frequently intolerant of contradiction and extremely derisive toward orthodoxy. The so-called "New Theology" and the "Modernism" now so vocal belong to this category.

The words "liberalist" and "latitudinarian" mean practically the same thing, though the latter perhaps carries the idea of a wider departure from evangelical standards.

---

[4] Cf George Henslow: *Present-Day Rationalism Critically Examined*, Chap. II.

[5] Henslow, *ut supra*, Chap. III.

CHAPTER III

V. CHIEF CAUSES OF DOUBT.[1]

1. Real Intellectual Difficulties.

It has already been said that there are honest doubters. Many people for a time become sorely perplexed with some of the difficulties of religion. Perhaps there are few thinking Christians who do not pass through a period of doubt at some time in their lives. Charles Spurgeon was wont to say that he was amazed at the weakness of the arguments adduced by infidels; he felt that, in view of his own experience with doubt, he could give them a good many "pointers"; they did not really seem to sound the depths of doubt. Thus skeptics should not imagine that Christian people have not had their times of mental perplexity.

2. Moral Causes.

It should be said kindly, but said nevertheless, that some men are unbelievers because their lives are evil,

[1] On this subject we recommend an old book (1841): David Nelson: *The Cause and Cure of Infidelity*. In its day it was very effective on account of its keen, direct and forceful manner of presentation. Nelson himself was rescued from infidelity in an unusual and interesting way, and the story of his experience with infidels is often piquant. A New York publishing company recently issued a new edition of this valuable book.

and they do not want to amend them, as the Bible requires. Note its demands: "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well" (Isa. 1:16, 17); "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy" (Prov. 28:13); "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:3); "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His Word is not in us" (1 John 1:9, 10).

So the skeptic should scrutinize his motives. Perhaps he does not want the Bible to be God's book, because it rebukes his manner of life, and threatens him with condign punishment. Christian workers, however, should remember that even the kind of skeptics just described may sometimes be won to Christ by kindly treatment and cogent reasoning.

3. Lack of Information.

Some doubters have not studied the Bible carefully. They have gone through it in a fragmentary way, chiefly to pick flaws, and have not mastered its teachings in a large and comprehensive sense, so as to grasp its wonderful and coherent system of truth, its rational world-view. If they would do this, they would likely be won by its uplifting and appealing character and would not haggle about small and unimportant matters.

Again, how many vocal skeptics have ever read

and studied a scientific work on Christian Apologetics or Theology? As a rule, unbelievers are not even aware of the existence of the large number of works on Christian Evidence that have been written from the beginning of the Christian era to the present time.

4. Absence of the Spiritual Mind.

Perhaps this is the chief source of skepticism. Spiritual things can be understood and appreciated only in a spiritual way. While the Bible touches on many subjects, yet it is preeminently a spiritual book, containing spiritual doctrines and messages.

To use an analogy, a person with no appreciation of poetry would hardly be competent to discern the merits of Tennyson's or Bryant's or Longfellow's lyrics. So a person who has no spiritual appreciation would not be likely to understand and receive the spiritual message of the Bible. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14).

We hope no skeptic will take offense at this plain speech. It is not meant in an ungenerous spirit, nor as a reflection on any man's intellectual competency. Neither would we want the doubter to abandon the processes of thought and investigation. Our only purpose is to show him that, in the end, the only way to obtain assurance regarding spiritual realities is through *spiritual* enlightenment and experience.

5. Inconsistent Professing Christians.

It must be said in all fairness that inconsistent professors of religion help to make skeptics; indeed, here is one of the most fruitful causes of skepticism. Such professed Christians put the very argument which the skeptics want into their mouths. If there were no hypocrites inside the Church, there would be fewer infidels outside the Church. An immoral church member may do more harm in a community than a dozen infidels. Such inconsistency cannot be too severely rebuked, and no palliation should be offered for it.

The Bible itself is clear and positive on this very point: "Abstain from all appearance of evil" (1 Thess. 5:22); "For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well doing than for evil doing" (1 Pet. 3:17); "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil-doer, or as a busybody in other men's matters; yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf" (1 Pet. 4:15, 16); "See that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise" (Eph. 5:15). "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16).

Let us look at the matter on all sides, however. The unbeliever who finds so much fault with church people should remember that, if Christianity were not in itself a good thing, false professors would never be called *hypocrites*. To call them so is in reality an acknowledgment of the high ethical standard required by the Christian religion—an involuntary tribute to Christi-

anity. Good money is the only kind that is counterfeited. Have you ever known wicked infidels to be called hypocrites? We think not. Is not that a tacit confession that their moral standards are not expected to be very high?

CHAPTER IV

VI. HISTORICAL SKETCH OF APOLOGETICS.[1]

1. The Apologetic Period (A. D. 70-350).

(1) *Apologists.*

The chief defenders of the Christian faith during this period were the following: Justin Martyr, Origen, Tatian, Irenæus, Cyprian, Tertullian, Lactantius, Arnobius.

(2) *Opponents.*

The chief opponents were: Jews, Gnostics, Ebionites, and the pagan philosophers Celsus, Lucian, Porphyry, Hierocles.

(3) *General character.*

After the apostolic age the early Christians met with opposition from the Jews, Gnostics, Ebionites, and pagan philosophers. The Jews opposed Christianity in those days as they had previously opposed Christ and the apostles. The Gnostics did not wholly reject the Christian religion, but mixed with it human knowledge (gnosis), that is, the philosophy and theosophy

[1] Interesting historical summaries of Apologetics are given in Garvie's *A Handbook of Christian Apologetics,* pp. 3-8, and Lindberg's *Apologetics; A System of Christian Evidence,* pp. 18-24.

of the day, thus corrupting it with pagan notions. The true apologists opposed all the Gnostic heresies, because they desired to preserve the Christian religion in its original purity and integrity.

The Ebionites were a Jewish sect who had become partly Christian; they accepted Christ, not as the incarnate, divine-human Redeemer, but only as the Jewish Messiah and as the greatest of the prophets.

The pagan opponents were the real infidels of the time, because they accepted no part of the Christian system; they were the ancient forerunners of all subsequent assailants of Christianity.

(4) *Apologists and opponents in conflict.*

Most of the objections to Christianity heralded today as "modern" and proclaimed as "discoveries" were advanced in this early period, at least in germinal form, and were answered by competent Christian scholars.[2] The Jews were answered by Justin Martyr in his classical work entitled *Dialogues with Trypho the Jew* (A. D. 130). Tertullian also entered the field against Judaism in his work, *Adverses Judaeos*. Cyprian wrote a work with the title *Testimonia Adversus Judaeos*. Justin Martyr wrote two *Apologies* in reply to heathen assailants and addressed them to the Emperor Antoninus Pius.

Celsus (about A. D. 150) was the first pagan who made something like a systematic and direct assault on Christianity. He was a man of wit and learning. Says Dr. Philip Schaff: "He anticipates most of the argu-

---

[2] Schaff: *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. II, p. 86.

ments and sophisms of the deists and infidels of later times." [3] Dr. C. F. Scott says: "Celsus, toward the end of the second century, anticipates almost all the objections which reappear in most of the modern criticisms of Christianity." [4]

This unbeliever was effectively answered by Origen in his well-known work *Contra Celsum.*

Lucian has been called the Voltaire of this period, because of his disposition to ridicule Christianity. Porphyry, a Neo-Platonist (died A. D. 304), was a bitter enemy of Christianity, and wrote fifteen books against it. He might be called the father of modern rationalistic Biblical criticism. Replies to him were made by Eusebius and Apollinaris. Hierocles was not only a writer against Christianity, but also a persecutor of Christians, showing that infidels will also persecute when the opportunity affords.[5]

2. The Polemical Period (250-730).

This period overlaps the first by a hundred years. It was a period of controversy, not so much with outright infidels as with heretics within the Church. For this reason it does not belong specifically to the science of Apologetics, but to Polemics, and therefore we need to dwell upon it only long enough to carry out the history consecutively. The chief defenders of the faith in this period were Alexander, Athanasius, Augustine

---

[3] Schaff, *ut supra,* p. 90.

[4] *The Apologetic Element in the New Testament,* p. 7.

[5] On this period read F. Watson's engaging book: *Defenders of the Faith.* Also Hurst: *History of the Christian Church,* vol. 1, pp. 180-206.

and Jerome. The chief heretics were Arius, Nestorius, Sabellius and Pelagius.

The Arian heresy denied the proper Deity of Christ, and held that He was the first and highest creature whom God created and through whom He created and saved the world. At the Council of Nicaea his doctrine was condemned, Athanasius being his chief opponent. Evangelical Christianity has ever since maintained the Athanasian doctrine of Christ's person.

Pelagius denied man's natural depravity, and was opposed by Augustine.[6]

During this important period the great Ecumenical Creeds were formulated (some of them only in part). The word "ecumenical" means world-wide, *general* or *universal*. These creeds are accepted by practically the whole (*universal*) Christian Church. Of course, heretical sections do not prize them, but often deride them. Usually it is regarded as a hall-mark of a thoroughgoing evangelical character when a denomination adopts and cherishes these great confessions of faith. They are as follows:

(1) *The Apostles' Creed.* It is so called because it contains a summary of what the apostles believed and taught. It is an outgrowth of the baptismal formula (to baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"). It was begun very early, perhaps soon after the death of the apostles. Its present text was settled in the fourth and fifth centuries.

---

[6] For this period see Hurst, *ut supra*, pp. 410-455.

(2) *The Nicene Creed.* This creed was formulated at the Council of Nicæa in A. D. 325. Its main purpose was to state correctly the doctrine of the Deity of Christ over against the Arians.

(3) *The Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed.* Date A. D. 381. At this time the doctrine of the Deity of the Holy Ghost was formally stated and added to the Nicene Creed. Usually this fuller statement is meant when the term *Nicene Creed* is used. At the Council of Chalcedon (451) this creed was formally adopted by practically the whole Church. In 589 at Toledo, Spain, the Western Church added the word *filioque* ("and the Son") in reference to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, who proceeds "from the Father *and the Son.*" The Eastern Church (Greek Catholic) has never accepted this addition.

(4) *The Athanasian Creed.* This creed was not composed by Athanasius, but is called by his name because it is a development of the doctrines he held and advocated. It was begun in the Polemical Period (perhaps in the fourth century), but its formulation was not completed as we now have it until the eighth or ninth century.

3. The Medieval Period (730-1517).

(1) *Defenders of Orthodox Christianity.*

Among these were Anselm of Canterbury, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Thomas Aquinas. Anselm in his great work, *Cur Deus Homo? (Why the God-man?)* made a powerful defense of the divine-human person of Christ

and the doctrine of the vicarious atonement. Bernard was the outstanding opponent of Abelard, the medieval heretic.

Aquinas wrote a learned work, *De Veritate Fidei*, against the Jews and Mohammedans. During this period Savonarola lived, and his work, *Triumphus Crucis*, was one of the effective Apologies of those times.

(2) *Chief heretic.*

In this period Abelard lived and wrote. He was not an infidel, but held unsound views on various doctrines of the Bible, especially the atonement. He was the medieval representative of much of the liberalism and "new theology" of our own day. Much that is called "new theology" today may be found in the disquisitions of Abelard.[7]

4. The Modern Period (1517 to date).

(1) *English Deism.*

This philosophy flourished in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Its advocates were infidels so far as regards the Bible but they were not atheists. They believed that God created the universe, then forsook it, and gave it over to the control of the secondary laws and forces with which He had endued it; much as if a man were to construct a machine that would run on its own power and then would leave it to do so. The Deists rejected the Bible, many of them with not a little scorn

---

[7] Lindberg, as above, gives a fuller account of this period. For a vivid and even thrilling account of the attempted debate between Abelard and Bernard see Samuel J. Eales: *Life and Times of St. Bernard*, pp. 163-184.

and vituperation, and deemed what they called "natural religion" to be sufficient for man's guidance. Hence they were correctly called infidels.

Among the protagonists of Deism may be mentioned Shaftesbury, Hobbes, Collins, Tindal, Bolingbroke and Sir Francis Newport. Their work culminated later in the universal skepticism of Hume and Gibbon.

The chief apologists of this period (those who made a sturdy defense of the Holy Scriptures) were Samuel Clark, Lardner, Bishop Horne, Joseph Butler, William Paley and Archbishop Whately. Butler was the author of that notable book, *The Analogy of Religion,* in which he showed that the very objections alleged by Deists against the God of the Bible could be brought with just as much force and justice against the God of nature, whom they professed to worship. Paley was the author of a well known book, *The Evidences of Christianity;* the famous "design" argument for the divine existence in its older form is largely attributed to him. Bishop Watson's famous *Apology* in reply to Thomas Paine's *The Age of Reason* belongs to this period. Paine was a deist, not an atheist.

(2) *French Encyclopedism.*

The French Encyclopedists, unlike the English Deists, became atheists. The chief of them were D'Alembert, Diderot, Voltaire[8] and Rousseau. They

[8] There is documentary evidence, however, to prove that Voltaire was not an atheist. Although he is rightly classed among infidels, for he was a vehement opponent of the Bible, Christianity and the Church; yet he even presented arguments against atheists in favor of the divine existence. See *The Encyclopedia Americana, in loco.*

were called Encyclopedists because they founded and wrote a great French encyclopedia, which was intended to contain all the enlightened knowledge of the time, and to omit from it everything that suggested God or the supernatural. It was planned on the basis of Bacon's Classification of Science. The Encyclopedists were effectively dealt with by Bishop Horne in his great work, *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Holy Scriptures*, which, old as it is (1818), would be well worthy of study by the skeptics of the present day.

There is valid historical evidence that English Deism was carried into France by Voltaire (who for a time lived in England), and thence by him into Germany in the time of Frederick the Great, with whom this French infidel was intimately associated. In France the cult was largely turned into atheism and materialism; in Germany it developed into rationalism.[9]

(3) *German Rationalism.*

This tendency, which is more or less prevalent today in Germany, England and the United States, has various phases, and is divided into numerous schools, some of which are very radical, while others are more moderate and conservative. It is by no means to be identified with such movements as English Deism, French Encyclopedism and current infidelity; that is it does not reject the Bible and Christianity outright, and fight them openly, but accepts such parts of the Bible and the Christian system as agree with what are

[9] Cf. John Urquhart: *The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scriptures*, pp. 142-144.

regarded as the dictates of human reason. Thus it is linked up with the more or less destructive criticism of the Bible.

Its main contention is that *reason* is the final arbiter in matters of religion, and has a right to sit in judgment on the Bible, accepting this and rejecting that as it chooses. Its basic principles can be traced back to Porphyry, the assailant of Christianity of the third century. In modern times its earliest exponents were Spinoza and Astruc, the former a pantheistic philosopher, the latter a French physician.

In Germany the chief names connected with this movement are Semler, DeWette, Vatke, Eichhorn, Graf, Ewald and Wellhausen, who were critics of the Old Testament, and Baur and Strauss, who applied practically the same critical methods to the New Testament. In Holland, Kuenen is the most outstanding name; in France, Renan. In Great Britain we may mention Bishop Colenso, Samuel Davidson, Robertson Smith, George Adam Smith, Cheyne and Driver; in America, Briggs (though in later years he became quite conservative), Henry Preserved Smith, McGiffert, Kent, Foster, Case, Bade and Peritz.

It must be said that the English and American critics named above (with perhaps the exception of Bade) aim to be "mediating" critics—that is they try to effect a reconciliation between the radical criticism of Graf and Wellhausen and the evangelical view. However, their position is obviously illogical; for by tearing the Bible to pieces and finding in it numerous supposed

scientific, historical and ethical errors, they destroy confidence in its divine inspiration and authority. In every case, when a theologian adopts the so-called critical hypothesis, he questions the divine inspiration and historical verity of some portions of the Bible.

(4) *Popular infidelity.*

In England and America there was much outspoken infidelity during the nineteenth century, especially up to about the year 1890. It was much given to ridicule, and frequently appealed to science, especially the theory of evolution, as being in direct opposition to the teachings of the Bible. It also had a penchant for finding historical and other contradictions in the Bible; and, strange to say, these much-proclaimed discrepancies were the same as those which are brought forward today by the negative Biblical critics in support of their hypotheses. At the time of which we speak, infidelity was quite well organized in places, issued many books, tracts and periodicals, and could boast of some conspicuous leaders. At present, however, infidelity in this country seems to lack organization and leadership.[10]

Judging from Dr. P. M. Muir's excellent book, *Modern Substitutes for Christianity*, and Dr. George

---

[10] It must be said, however, that, since the above was first written (1922), there has been a decided revival of the old-time radical infidelity in this country. Moreover, an organization of atheists has been formed and is quite aggressive. Efforts have also been made to organize anti-Bible Societies. There seems to be a resurgence of popular infidelity.

Henslow's *Present-Day Rationalism Critically Examined*, we are led to conclude that outspoken infidelity is more rife in England than in America at the present time.[11] It has some advocates of a good deal of force and scholarly attainment, with qualities of leadership.

Although frank and outspoken, the English infidels do not deal so largely in raillery and traduction as did the infidels of fifty years ago. Most of them are ready to credit Christianity with having a more or less salutary influence in the world; only they want to find a substitute that will be more effective. But they cannot agree as to what the substitute shall be. Some say, "morality without religion"; others, "the religion of the universe"; others, "the religion of humanity"; still others, "Theism without Christ."

Most of the English infidels call themselves Rationalists today, being the successors of the Secularists of the "seventies" (that is, the years 1870-1880), in the days when Mr. Bradlaugh "was a prominent figure before the world and was promulgating his atheistic views." The Rationalist Press Association, which is the infidel organization of Great Britain, publishes a number of periodicals, brochures and books, and is "professedly based on Darwinism." What is known as "materialistic Monism" is one form of this kind of Rationalism.

---

[11] On the situation in England (at least as it was before the World War), consult, in addition to Muir and Henslow, the following works: C. L. Drawbridge: *Common Objections to Christianity; Popular Attacks on Christianity* (1914); A. F. Winnington-Ingram: *Popular Objections to Christianity; Reasons for Faith.*

English Rationalism must be distinguished from German Rationalism; the former is purely infidel; the latter accepts the parts of the Bible that agree with reason and rejects the other parts. Both kinds of Rationalism, however, make human reason the final arbiter in matters of religion.

(5) *Modernism.*[12]

This term came into vogue a number of years ago in connection with a liberalistic movement in the Roman Catholic Church, led by Father Tyrrell, M. Loisy, and others. It was condemned by the Pope's encyclical. In more recent times, however, the term has sprung into popular use in England and America; but it wants to claim no kinship with its precursor in the Catholic Church.

Modernism, as it is known today, is rather the outgrowth of the old spirit of Rationalism which held sway in the last century in Germany, and then travelled over into England and from there to America. It is like its predecessor in that it ever wants to make "reason," or "experience," or "the religious consciousness," the standard of judgment over against the Bible wherever these come into conflict with the clear teaching of that holy book.

It must be said, however, in strict fairness, that it is by no means out-and-out infidel; that is, it does not reject the Bible and the Christian system outright.

---

[12] For a somewhat extended review and analysis of Modernism, see the author's two brochures: *The Doctrines of Modernism* (1925) and *The Conflict of Fundamentalism and Modernism* (1926).

Perhaps the best description of it might be that it is partly Christian and partly un-Christian. Most of its exponents believe in God, and often oppose the materialistic and mechanistic view of the world. They also believe in Christ as a historical character, and often speak feelingly of His "beautiful ideals," His sinless life, "the *way* of Jesus," and sometimes even declare belief in His "divinity," meaning as a rule that all men have something divine in them; only they hold that Christ possessed more of the divine quality than any one else in the world's history. Hence He is a worthy example to follow. When His teachings are really "discovered," by deleting the accretions that have gathered about them in the gospels, they are to be accepted as the highest standard. These are some of the beliefs of the advocates of Modernism.

What, now are some of its other outstanding marks? They are the following:

a. It boasts much of its *superior scholarship* and seems to imply that evangelical believers are lacking in that acquirement; it is apparently afflicted with the "superiority complex." b. It is ambitious to be considered strictly up-to-date (hence its name, Modernism). c. It accepts only those portions of the Bible that tally with human "reason" or "experience." d. It discards many narratives and other representations in the Bible as "outmoded categories," and accepts only those parts that can be "repeated" in the "experiences of the modern mind." [18] e. It cannot tolerate the miracles recorded in the Bible, but regards them as

[18] Quoted from Harry Emerson Fosdick.

"later accretions," and often as a burden too great for faith to bear. f. The Miraculous Conception and the Virgin Birth of Christ are especially objectionable to the Modernist. g. The vicarious or substitutional atonement wrought by Christ is offensive to them, because they hold that Christ died only as a martyr to the cause of truth. h. Modernism is bound up body and soul with the theory of evolution including the doctrine of man's animal pedigree.

Thus Modernism desires to be considered very scientific; therefore, those parts of the Bible which do not agree with the evolution theory must be thrown overboard or relegated to the limbo of myth, legend, allegory or folklore.

Modernism has numerous representatives in America. Of course, some of them are more radical than others. On some points there is no consensus among them;-but practically all of them are agreed on at least these two points—that the Bible is an errant book in many ways and that evolution is the divine *modus operandi* in bringing all things, including man, to their present stage of development.

It is gratifying to be able to say, in closing this section, that the contentions of both the Modernists and the outright infidels are being met and refuted today by a large number of evangelical scholars who are thoroughly equipped for their task; who are not only the peers of their opponents in scholarship, critical acumen and logical praxis, but who also have had a clear and satisfying experience of the truth of Christianity in

its blessed fullness by the inner witness of the Holy Spirit through the Word of God–who have been "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever" (1 Pet. 1:23).

CHAPTER V

VII. METHODOLOGY.

1. Definition.

Methodology *treats of the scientific way of classifying, correlating and developing the material of any science either as a whole or in any of its branches.*

Its principles, processes and results are employed whenever an attempt is made to organize and unfold a science.

2. Methodology of the Present Work.

(1) *Note on the General Outline.*

Our plan is clearly shown in the General Outline printed on page eight of this book. There the whole system will be seen to be divided into five main parts; while in the text itself are set forth the several major and minor divisions and subdivisions, all of them numbered in an orderly way, which, we hope can be easily mastered.

(2) *The Main Proposition in Christian Apologetics.*

We believe it to be this:

The Bible a Special Divine Revelation[1]

There is, to our mind, a decided advantage in making this the main thesis; for if it can be upheld effectively, *it will carry with it the proof of all the Christian doctrines;* not one will be omitted; all will be found to be true in their Biblical fullness; each will have its proper relative value assigned to it; each will be set forth in its proper relation to all the rest and to the integral system.

Therefore we shall begin with the Bible, and shall try to prove its divine origin and inspiration by all the available internal and external evidences. True, some of these proofs are more convincing than others. For example, the strongest proof of the divine origin of the Bible is Jesus Christ as He is set forth in Prophecy and history, the wonderfully unique character of all time.

That does not mean that other arguments are not convincing, especially when connected and correlated with the plan of redemption through Jesus Christ as depicted in Holy Writ. The Bible is an organism, not a collection of *disjecta membra;* therefore all its parts are necessary in order to present fully and effectively

---

[1] Perhaps our main thesis might be more fully expressed in this way: *The Bible the divinely inspired record of God's special revelation to mankind.* However, the method of expression in the text is much less cumbersome and means practically the same thing. There is a sense in which the Bible itself, being divinely inspired, is also a special revelation from God, for no inspiration could be given without some kind of a divine revelation of the factuality of the method described.

the divine plan of creation, providence, redemption and destiny.

(3) *Other methods considered.*

a. Some apologists hold that we should make *Christ* the standard or norm or chief thesis, and build on Him. But how do we know who Christ is except through the Bible? Far too often people who profess to make Christ, and not the Bible, the standard, have lax and defective views both of the Bible and of Christ. The reason is self-evident: they accept *the Christ of their own ideas and imagination instead* of the *historic Christ* set forth in full and living power and beauty *in the Bible*, including both the Old and the New Testaments.

No! you cannot divorce Christ and the Bible; they are woven together into one fabric. Christ is not "the gospel *in* the gospel," as some phrase it; He is the gospel *of* the gospel. Christ is the proof of the Bible, and the Bible is the proof of Christ. True, Christ is the center of the Bible, but there can be no center without radii and periphery. Some say that Christ is the *heart* of the Bible; true, but a heart must have a living body in which to throb and function.[2]

b. Others desire to make *salvation* the chief thesis.

---

[2] Greatly did we appreciate Dr. William Brenton Greene's lengthy and cordial review of the second edition of this work in *The Princeton Theological Review*. He offered no criticism, but seemed to think that a better method might be to make Christ, His Person and Work, the main thesis of an apologetic system. However, after canvassing the matter as fully as possible, we feel that there are fewer difficulties in carrying out the plan followed in the previous editions, for the reason already

They hold that only those teachings of the Bible which are essential to salvation need be accepted as from God.

But it must be evident that such a method means the mutilation of the Bible, allowing every one to accept only what *he thinks* is essential to salvation; therefore human reason, not the Bible, becomes man's guide. Such a method leads invariably to rationalism:

c. A favorite proposition with certain liberalists in theology is the contention that only the *spiritual* or *religious truths* of the Bible need to be accepted.

This again is a defective method: it leads to selecting and choosing in the Bible; for by this plan each one must use his own judgment as to which parts *are* spiritual and which are *not*. Who is wise enough to decide that question? Is not the spiritual teaching everywhere interwoven with the historical narratives, which are everywhere recited as if the writers meant to describe facts? The spiritual element cannot be torn from the web of history without destroying that fabric. Most of all, how can we know that the spiritual teachings are true if the history is false? The sum of it is, the spiritual truths of the Bible are found everywhere in the Bible, even in the genealogical tables.

d. To make the *Christian consciousness* the ultimate court of appeal, as some liberalistic theologians,

---

assigned: that then all the doctrines of the Christian system will be upheld and correlated. This does not mean that all the doctrines are alike important, but it does mean that all of them are integral parts of the system of Christian truth; all of them centering in Christ, the incarnate Son of God.

especially the Ritschlians, desire to do, is most perilous, leading to all kinds of mysticism, fanaticism and hallucination. Christian experience is very important; indeed, it is one of the fundamental proofs of the divine verity of the Biblical revelation. But how is Christian experience begotten? It is begotten through the Word of God, and must be tested and guided by the same inspired Word.

Therefore, Christian experience (otherwise the Christian consciousness) is not a judge of the Bible, but is judged by the Bible, having been begotten by the Holy Spirit through the Bible. No one has ever had an evangelical conversion except through the truth revealed in the Holy Scriptures. "How shall they believe Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent? . . . So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God" (Rom. 10:14-17).

We repeat: If, according to the method adopted in this manual, we can succeed in proving the Bible to be God's special revelation to men, we shall have established and proved, *ipso facto*, all the doctrines of the Christian system in their integrity and organic unity. Let us remember always that all the doctrines of the Bible are inter-dependent; all belong to the very structure of Christianity. Only by accepting the whole Bible as God's Book can we be sure of the great doctrines of creation, of moral agency, of sin, its origin and enormity, of the divine method of preparation for redemption through Christ, of the accomplished re-

demption itself, of the application of redemption by the Holy Spirit through the Word and sacraments and of the final destiny of the human race and of the universe. Accept the whole Bible, and the Christian system in all its comprehensiveness and organic completeness, is perfectly clear and coherent.

(4) *The Internal and External Evidences.*

Some modern apologists--usually those who are inclined to liberalism--find fault with this methodology. But we hold that, while it has long been in vogue, it is antiquated. No valid objection, so far as we have discovered, has been brought against it, and no better method has gained currency among true, evangelical apologists. Every other method leads to more or less obscurity. At all events, we have found no plan that seems to be more logical, inclusive and scientific.

(5) *Another classification.*

Another classification of the material of Apologetics is the following: I. Fundamental Apologetics; II. Historical Apologetics; III. Philosophical Apologetics. We have no special objection to this scheme, provided it is used in an evangelical way and spirit; yet we think the distinctions in the several parts are not sufficiently clear, and would overlap a good deal. At all events, we find that we cannot follow this outline conveniently, nor include in it all the topics we desire to treat in a work prepared for our specific purpose--that of proving the truth of the Christian system.

Besides, all parts of the system of Christian truth are fundamental, historical, and more or less philosophical. Therefore, we shall proceed to present and unfold our main thesis, "The Bible a Special Divine Revelation."

Part II

THE BIBLE A SPECIAL DIVINE REVELATION

CHAPTER VI

---

1. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

1. The Probability of a Special Divine Revelation.

If there is a *personal God*, the probability that He would reveal Himself in a *personal* way is very great. He has, indeed, revealed Himself more or less clearly in nature and reason; but surely He would scarcely think a general, impersonal revelation sufficient for His rational creatures. This would be particularly true if they should fall into sin and peril. Why would He not go to their rescue? An earthly parent would do so.

Moreover, ought not every one to rejoice in believing that God has come to man's help in a clear, definite, loving way, just as the Bible reveals? One would think that all persons would welcome such a revelation and feel that it is good news indeed.

2. The Possibility of Such a Revelation.

A being who could not reveal Himself above the natural order of His creation would be a very limited being, and therefore could not be the true God. If this great universe is in the hands of a helpless being, we are of all creatures most helpless and miserable.

A God who would permit himself to get caught in the machinery of his own making, or who would voluntarily put himself into it, and never operate upon it from without, would, indeed, be a poor and incomplete sort of a God.

3. The Need of Such a Revelation.

The status of the heathen world proves this need. They have had the light of nature and reason to guide them through all the centuries. Has the result been satisfactory? Is there even an unbeliever who would care to exchange our civilization for theirs; or if he had to make a choice, who would prefer any of their religions to the Christian religion? Perhaps God has left them to their own devices without special revelation partly to prove to the world that a special revelation is necessary.

As far as regards the philosophers, observe the vagueness and uncertainty of their teachings and speculations; their inability to solve the very problems that are most vital to human welfare—the problems of sin, of pardon, salvation and immortality. Plato speculated about sin, but could come to no definite conclusion; he did not know whether the gods could forgive sin, and even if they could, whether they ought. He also ex-

pressed the hope that sometime a special divine revelation would be vouchsafed to mankind because of the great uncertainty of human reason.

Moreover, no two philosophers agree; in fact, most of them undermine one another's speculations. For example, Democritus and Epicurus were materialists whose philosophies were the direct opposite of the conceptions of Plato and Aristotle, who believe in God, though from the Christian viewpoint their ideas of Him were very defective. Coming down later in history, Kant was a theist, Spinoza a pantheist, Haeckel an atheist. In these three cases the philosophies are mutually destructive. Among believers in the Bible, there are differences of opinion in minor matters, but the differences are not fundamental. The status of heathen religions and the lack of a consensus among philosophers certainly demonstrate the need of a special divulgence from God.

4. Why God Made a Book.

Books are the best method of preserving the truth in its integrity and transmitting it from generation to generation. Memory and tradition are very untrustworthy. Therefore, God acted with the greatest wisdom, and also in the normal way, in giving His revelation to men in book form.

In no other way, so far as we can see, could He have imparted to mankind an infallible norm that would be available for everybody, and that would continue intact throughout the ages, and from which all people could procure the same standard of faith and practice.

Subject experience would be too obscure and variable unless it were directed by a higher and more certain objective authority. A universal standard must be an objective one; therefore a book.

5. No Rational Substitute for Christianity.

What other system of religion could men in Christian lands accept? Surely not Mohammedanism, or Hinduism, or Buddhism, or Confucianism, or Taoism. Eclecticism would be available only for the learned, and even they would never agree. Theosophy is too hazy and speculative for the vast majority of people; it is esoteric. Positivism, both as a philosophy and a religion has proved a dismal failure. The "Religion of Nature" was fully tested in the days of Deism in England, and rapidly degenerated into atheism or universal skepticism. So with people in Christian lands it is either Christianity or no religion at all. Which alternate will they choose?

6. Rejection of Christianity Means Nescience.

Nescience or nihilism in thought means doubt of everything, even the validity of knowledge. What has history proved? That the best efforts of the skeptical school end in agnosticism—Hume, Gibbon, Schopenhauer, Von Hartmann, Darwin, Spencer, Huxley—and agnosticism finds its last home in pessimism.

If we reject the Bible we must admit that we know little or nothing about God, creation, man's origin, purpose and destiny, the cause and *raison d'être* of sin and suffering, and of a way of salvation. The door of the future is shut down against us, and we beat against

it in vain. A well-known non-Christian scientist declared not long ago that the origin of man is wrapped in complete obscurity. Then, if we know nothing of man's origin, it follows that we know nothing of his purpose and destiny. Thus without the Bible the universe is indeed a "riddle" (German, *Raetsel*), as Haeckel, the materialist, called it. All is gloom, uncertainty, nihilism.

To confirm what has just been said, we refer to Sir Arthur Keith, the noted scientist and advocate of Darwinian evolution. He is a Rationalist of the English type—that is, one who does not accept the Bible as the Word of God. In the Foreword of his recent book (published the latter part of 1928) he says: "Religious leaders and men of science have the same ideals; they want to understand and explain the universe of which they are a part; they both earnestly desire to solve, if a solution be ever possible, that great riddle: Why are we here?"

To a great scientist who does not accept the Bible that question, "Why are we here?" may be "that great riddle"; but to boys and girls who are instructed in the principles of Christianity it is *a*, *b*, *c*. In essence they would put it this way: We are here to trust, love and serve God and do good to our fellow men and to prepare for something better in the life to come. And that certainly is definite, worth while and uplifting.

7. Some Definitions.

At this point it will be necessary to give a few definitions in order to understand the terminology current in the science of Christian Apologetics.

(1) *Genuineness.*

By this term is meant that a book of the Bible was written by the author to whom it has been historically ascribed, as when we say, "Moses wrote the Pentateuch," "Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans."

(2) *Authenticity and Credibility.*

These terms mean that the Bible or any book of the Bible tells the truth and is worthy of belief.

(3) *Integrity.*

This means that the Bible has been kept intact through all the centuries, free from essential error and corruption; that we have it today in every essential respect as it originally came from God.

(4) *Biblical Proofs Moral, not Demonstrative.*

This means that they are cogent and convincing, but do not *force* belief, as does a mathematical demonstration. They are persuasive, not coercive. Faith is a free, moral act of the mind, not a mechanical one. The real certitude concerning the divine character of the Bible comes from spiritual experience, not from mathematical demonstration. The reasoning in a system of Christian Evidence is intended to convince the intellect, and thus dispose men to go to the true and ultimate Source of assurance; it does not give that assurance itself, for that would be usurping the office of the Holy Spirit.

(5) *Biblical Proofs Cumulative.*

This term means that the proofs, presented in logical order, grow in cogency, until at length they become

convincing to the reason. Therefore patient investigation is necessary; haste may prove fatal.

(6) *Internal Proofs.*

By internal proofs are meant those proofs that deal with the contents and teaching of the Bible itself. It often occurs that the character of a book carries its own credentials—its own evidence of its truthfulness and honesty.

(7) *External Proofs.*

The external proofs of the divine character of the Bible are those which are based on evidences outside of the Bible, as for example, history, archaeology, salutary influence, etc.

(8) *The Terms Orthodox, Conservative, Evangelical.*

Those thinkers and scholars who oppose the liberalists and contend for the integrity and divine authority of the whole Bible and all its doctrines are known as "orthodox," "conservative," and "evangelical," and their view is generally known as the "traditional" view, because it has come down to our times as the *historical* conception of the Christian system.

These terms are worthy of analysis. The term "orthodox" means *straight or true thinking* (from *orthos*, straight, true, and *doxazo* believe); therefore no one should be ashamed to be called orthodox. On the other hand, "heterodox" means *other* (*heteros*) variant belief—that is thinking *other* than in a straight line.

Those who are "conservative" mean by that term

that they wish to *conserve* the truth of the past, and not throw it overboard. It is possible, however, to be ultra-conservative, which means that one is determined to hold on to everything that is old, whether it is true or not.

The word "evangelical" is a good word, meaning the preservation of the true evangel—that is the true teaching of the whole gospel without reduction, shading or modification. A "traditionalist" may be *ultra* or not, according to the spirit that actuates him. It is likely that a traditional view has much truth in its favor, but one should not hold on to a tradition merely because it is old, or comes down from the past. Is a doctrine *true?* is the ultimate criterion.

CHAPTER VII

II. INTERNAL PROOFS OF THE DIVINE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

1. Its Profound and Rational Doctrines.

(1) *The doctrine of God.*

No other book of religion or philosophy sets forth so profound, rational and all-sphered a doctrine of God. Note some of His outstanding attributes.

He is *personal*, and that is a great and satisfying conception; for a personal God can know, feel and will, and men can hold communion with Him.

The God of the Bible is *holy, loving and just.* Are not these the very attributes that God ought to have if He exists? Men want an *ethical Being* as the Creator and Governor of the universe.

He *cares for His creation*, and especially for the rational and sentient beings He has brought into existence. He is merciful to them, yet just in His requirements. Is not that the kind of a God whom men can love, and at the same time respect?

Then He is *all-powerful* and *all-wise*, so that nothing can occur that will ultimately thwart His decrees and plans. Thus it is said by an apostle, "All things work

together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to His purpose."

Sometimes He is represented as *stern, but only* toward wicked and impenitent sinners; never toward those who repent and act righteously. This, too, is as it should be to hold the respect of ethically-minded people.

And remember that this exalted doctrine of God is taught clearly and consistently from the first book of the Bible to the last. Compare the Biblical representations of the Deity with the hazy speculations of philosophy and the crude conceptions of the ethnic religions.

One of the most striking features of the Bible is its doctrine of pure Monotheism (the doctrine of one God) from beginning to end, while all the nations surrounding the Hebrews were steeped in polytheism and animism. How did the writers of the Bible come by their superior knowledge of God unless it was by divine revelation?

The argument is greatly strengthened by the fact that even today the only religions that are monotheistic are Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism, and all of them drew their conception of God from the Bible. Wherever the Bible has not gone, idolatry, polytheism and animism are prevalent. What gave to the Biblical writers their unique wisdom if it was not divine inspiration? And remember that they themselves attribute this knowledge to God's direct revelation, not to their own thinking or the process of evolution. There is no good reason for believing that men of such pellucid honesty would have falsified.

(2) *The doctrine of man.*[1]

According to the Bible, man is a personal, moral, free, spiritual being, created in the divine image; capable of choosing between right and wrong; able not to sin or to sin but if he does sin, redeemable and worth saving.

He was started in his career amid environments that gave him a fair chance—that is, in a garden, not in a noisome jungle; yet he was created a free moral agent, and therefore had to have a test to bring out and discipline his moral character. He was no automaton, or robot, nor is he one now. He can hold personal communion with the God who created him and who redeems him, and who will finally confer upon him a destiny of bliss and glory.

Is not this an exalted conception of man? And it is consistently carried out in the Bible from beginning to end. Never do the Biblical writers strike a false note in anthropology. What a powerful evidence this that the Bible is a truthful, divinely inspired Book! How else could its writers have gotten such a profound conception of man!

(3) *The doctrine of salvation.*

Again, the Bible is consistent throughout in setting forth the doctrine of redemption. Man was created in the divine image, a free, sentient, rational being; then

---

[1] An excellent book on this thesis is James Orr: *God's Image in Man and its Defacement in the Light of Modern Denials.* Also Schmid: *Doctrinal Theology*, pp. 217-231. Another good book is John Laidlaw: *The Bible Doctrine of Man: The Anthropology and Psychology of Scripture.*

when he fell into sin and trouble, the loving God who created him in His own image and made him His son immediately inaugurated a plan for saving him; and this plan, carried consistently through the Old Testament dispensation, came to fruition in the "fullness of time" in the New Testament, when the eternal Son of God came to the earth and took upon Himself the moral task which man was unable to bear, and thus redeemed man and brought him back into ethical and spiritual accord with his Maker.

That is the wonderful plan of redemption taught in the Bible. How wise, loving, gracious and inspiring! Is it not a powerful internal proof that the Bible comes from God? Compare this redemptive method with the futile schemes of the ethnic religions.[2]

2. The Purity of Its Ethics.

Everywhere in the Bible clear moral distinctions are drawn; there is no blurring of them, as is the case in the ethnic religions and in most of the schemes of human speculation. In the Bible, righteousness is everywhere commanded and commended; sin is always condemned. Inner purity, not merely outward, ceremonial and conventional morality, is always inculcated.

Let us be more specific. After God had finished his creation, including man, He pronounced everything "very good" (Gen. 1:31); this refers to moral as well

---

[2] Cf. S. H. Kellogg: *A Handbook of Comparative Religion;* H. G. Underwood: *The Religions of Eastern Asia;* R. E. Hume: *The World's Living Religions.*

as physical good,[3] for it embraces man, who was made a moral agent. Thus the Bible represents the universe as a *moral economy* from the very beginning.

In the garden of Eden was placed the "tree of the knowledge of good or evil." Here again is a clear conception of moral distinctions. Abel's offering was accepted because he was righteous; Cain's was rejected because "sin croucheth at the door" (Gen. 4:7). The wicked antediluvians were destroyed in the flood because "the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6:5). Noah was saved because God found him righteous (Gen. 7:1).

Nations and peoples were punished and destroyed, but always on account of their wickedness; no nation was ever dealt with severely when it walked in the way of righteousness. Observe how sternly the Bible rebukes those who blur or obliterate moral distinctions: "Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil; that put darkness for light and light for darkness" (Isa. 5:20)!

Note from the specific teaching of the Bible how high its moral standards are. The Ten Commandments have never been excelled for their lofty practical morality. How fundamentally ethical Bible-teaching is: "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of Thy throne" (Ps. 89:14); "Thy right hand, O God, is full of righteousness" (Ps. 48:10); "Thy testimonies are

---

[3] The Hebrew word for good (*tov*) is applied in the Bible to God Himself; hence it means moral as well as physical excellence.

righteous forever" (Ps. 119:114). Scores of similar passages might be quoted, showing that God is inherently righteous.

The Bible always commends upright people: "For Jehovah knoweth the way of the righteous; but the way of the wicked shall perish" (Ps. 1:6); "The memory of the righteous is blessed; but the name of the wicked shall rot" (Prov. 10:7); "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God" (Micah 6:8). "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doing from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow" (Isa. 1:16, 17). Who can find fault with such ethics?

That the Bible requires inward purity is evident in all its teaching: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me" (Ps. 51:10); "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me" (Ps. 66:18); "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. 5:8); "For I say unto you, except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20).

The plan of redemption itself is fundamentally ethical, because it means salvation from a sinful life to a holy life. The Holy Spirit, for the very reason that He is *holy*, begets within man a *holy* principle and dynamic in regeneration.

Many more citations might be given. This is the

consistent ethical teaching of the Holy Scriptures throughout. Is it not a strong internal proof of the divine origin of the Bible? How could its writers, unaided by the Divine Spirit, have gained such lofty ethical conceptions and found the adequate language in which to present them?[4]

3. The Unity and Consistency of Its Teaching.

Written by about forty different authors, in different countries, separated by about 1,500 years, yet the Bible throughout teaches the same great doctrines regarding God, man, morality, salvation and immortality. There is not a false or discordant note on any of these great basal doctrines. Only cavillers will find fault with small apparent discrepancies (due largely to errors in transcription, but affecting not a single important historical or doctrinal fact[5]) in view of the remarkable unity of the teaching of the Bible on all things that are important and fundamental.

What is the only adequate explanation of this unity of teaching? That it was *all God-breathed* (2 Tim. 3:16); all inspired by one Mind, the Mind of the Holy

---

[4] Cf. Kellogg and Underwood as above: Orr: *The Bible Under Trial*, pp. 227-253; Pierson: *Many Infallible Proofs*, pp. 145-182; Row: *A Manual of Christian Evidences*, Part I, pp. 27-120; Bruce: *The Ethics of the Old Testament;* Keyser: *A System of Christian Ethics*, pp. 84-93; *Contending for the Faith*, Chap. IV, pp. 63-82; *The Profound Moral Teaching of the Old Testament*, in *The Lutheran Quarterly*, April, 1922.

[5] Cf. Schaff: *Introduction to the American Edition of the New Testament in the Original Greek* (*Westcott and Hort's text*), pp. 53-58, with most valuable quotations from Dr. Ezra Abbott.

Spirit (2 Pet. 1:19-21). Is any other explanation adequate?

To impress this argument still more deeply upon the reader's mind, we again call attention to the fact that the human philosophers nullify and destroy one another's systems fundamentally; no two agree on many of the most vital points. If Plato is right, Democritus is basically wrong; the same is true in a comparison between Kant and Spinoza, between Leibnitz and Hegel.

Note, too, the Old and New Testament are organically connected, the former leading up historically and logically to the latter. While there is, as there should be, progress in teaching and revelation, there is vital agreement. "The Old Testament is patent in the New, and the New is latent in the Old," says an acute writer. Another says: "While there is no collision among the writers, neither is there any evidence of collusion." [6]

4. Its Historical Character.

The Bible professes to recite history from the narrative of Genesis I, to the last chapter of the Acts and even throughout the Epistles and the Revelation of St. John. Never is its religious teaching wrested from the stream of human history. The plan of redemption is interwoven with the warp and woof of the history it records. Christianity is a historical religion. It is

---

[6] Cf. Pierson: *The Inspired Word*, pp. 338-359; Adolph Saphir: *The Divine Unity of Scripture* (a notable book); MacArthur: *The Old Book and the Old Faith*, pp. 193-206; Burrell: *Why I Believe the Bible*, pp. 26-34.

not a flight of the imagination; not a mosaic of myths, legends, folk-lore and human tradition.

This makes it a real religion. The numerous historical details give the Bible the impression of verisimilitude, and prove that it was never meant to be regarded as a collection of legends, myths and allegories. Again these facts are a strong internal evidence of its veracity and divine character. If the Biblical history is true, then the Bible is a true record of divine revelation and inspiration, and all its doctrines are established as factualities.

5. The Soberness of Its Teaching.

In the Bible even the most momentous events are narrated in a calm, simple, dignified way that is inimitable and bears the marks of its own credibility. Note the narratives of the creation, the flood, the crucifixion, the resurrection and ascension of Christ. Observe the absence of fanaticism or of utopian and visionary theories and guesses. The teaching of Christ and His apostles is marked by soberness throughout. Compare the pretended revelations and visions of Mohammed and Joseph Smith, and also the vagaries of theosophy. Another proof, this, of the probity and sound sense of the Biblical writers.

6. The All-Sidedness of Its Teaching.

The more we examine its teaching, the more we see that it avoids the one-sidedness of all human speculations. Every human system over-stresses some things and under-stresses others, and thus becomes defective

and one-sided. To give concrete examples of the all-sidedness of Biblical teaching, note the following data:

It points out the true relation of nature and spirit, never confusing them; of God and the world, making both real, yet never mixing the divine essence with the essence of the cosmos; of man's dual nature, body and soul, without minimizing the value of either, or denying its reality; of practical life and mystical communion with God, correlating them in due order and ratio; of the present life and the future, enjoining that godliness has the promise of both (1 Tim. 4:8).

Compare the all-sidedness of Christian teaching with the one-sided teaching of human philosophies: Idealism[7] denies the reality of matter, and teaches that *only* mind exists. Christianity teaches the reality of both matter and mind. Materialism says that the only entity is matter, and that mind does not exist. How different Christianity, as has just been said!

Pantheism holds that God is only immanent, and rejects the doctrine of His personality and transcendence; Christianity teaches clearly both His transcendence and immanence. Deism is the opposite of Pantheism; Christianity rejects the error and inculcates the truth taught by Deism.

Secularism one-sidedly emphasizes this present earthly life and ignores the future; Fanaticism overemphasizes the future life and neglects the present; Plato, the Gnostics and the Manicheans despised the

---

[7] For the definitions of Idealism, Materialism, Pantheism, and other terms used in these paragraphs, see further on in this book (Chap. XVII).

body and thought it was the seat of evil; Buddhism also pours contempt on all desire, calling it *tanha,* and aims to get rid of it entirely; Hinduism teaches caste, transmigration and final reabsorption of the soul into the unconscious All, which is the only God it knows; Confucianism ignores God and the future, and teaches only a system of social ethics for this world.

But observe that Christianity commits none of these erratic mistakes, but is a complete, perfectly balanced philosophy. The internal evidence of the divine origin of the Bible becomes cumulative.

7. Its Relevancy to Human Needs.

(1) *It satisfies man's longing for God.*

"As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God" (Ps. 42: 1, 2). Let it be noticed that the Bible gives assurance of communion not with a dead God, not with an impersonal God like that of Pantheism, not with an absentee God like that of Deism, not with a finite and more or less helpless God like the God of John Stuart Mill, William James and H. G. Wells, but with a living, personal, gracious and all-powerful God, the Sovereign of the universe.

(2) *It complements man's conscious weakness.*

In regeneration the Holy Spirit implants a new principle of spiritual life in men's minds, giving them new feelings, new strength against evil, new views of God and of Christ and the Bible—in short, making them "new creatures in Christ Jesus." Note some pertinent passages: "Verily I say unto thee, Except a man

be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3), implying that, if one does receive such an experience, he will be assured of the principles of the divine kingdom. This, it may be said, has been the experience of millions of twice-born men.

Note again: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me" (Phil. 4:13). "And He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness" (2 Cor. 12:9).

The doctrine of regeneration is *distinctive* of Christianity; it is unknown in other religions and in human philosophy, which leave poor, depraved human nature in its status of congenital weakness, without supernatural aid. "For whosoever is begotten of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith. And who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (1 John 5:4, 5).

(3) *It gives positive assurance of truth.*

Let us note some passages that are germane: "Jesus therefore answered them and said, My teaching is not mine, but His that sent Me. If any man is willing to do His will he shall *know of the teaching*, whether it is of God, or whether I speak of Myself" (John 7:17); "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall *know* the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32); "Jesus said unto him, I am the way, and the truth and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me" (John 14:6); "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself" (1 John 5:10).

These and similar passages are the crux of the whole matter, for the Holy Spirit in conversion or regeneration gives the believer full assurance of truth, pardon and salvation. If all men would receive this impingement on their consciousness, there would be no need of further argument.

(4) *It affords comfort in trial.*

This holds true in sickness, misfortune, earthly loss, contrition, bereavement and death (John 14:1-3; Rom. 8:28; 2 Cor. 4:17; Heb. 12:11). Note these: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God" (Rom. 8:28); "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to usward" (Rom. 8:18); "For our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. 4:17); "All chastening seemeth for the present to be not joyous but grievous; yet afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness to them that are exercised thereby" (Heb. 12:11); "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" (1 Cor. 15:56).

In the Old Testament also are many consoling passages: "Like as a father pitieth his children, so Jehovah pitieth them that fear Him: for He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust" (Ps. 103:13, 14); "Before I was afflicted I went astray; but now I observe thy Word"; "It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn thy statutes" (Ps. 119:67, 71).

Surely a book that gives so much consolation to people in weakness and trouble must be a good book; but if it is a good book, and at the same time claims to be from God, its testimony to itself must be true; it must be from God.

(5) *It promises the solution of all problems.*

In this respect it is indeed the complement of human need. Those problems that perplex us now will be solved hereafter. "Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt understand hereafter" (John 13:7); "For now we see in a glass, darkly, but then face to face: now I know in part, but then shall I know fully, even as I was fully known" (1 Cor. 13:12). This surely is a great and comforting assurance. What system of merely human thought offers such hope and consolation?

(6) *It meets the desire to be right with God.*

In nearly all religions the offering of sacrifices to propitiate the gods is prevalent. Of course, it is greatly perverted, as is everything else indeed; nevertheless, the principle is deeply ingrained in human nature. Men who are sinful feel that they cannot themselves merit favor from the supernatural powers, and so they must offer something as a substitution.

In the Christian system this great principle is met and upheld by the atonement or expiation that Christ, the Son of God, wrought for mankind. The Divine One, who is the basis of the holy law and its source, took the penalty of its violation on Himself, and thus satisfied the eternal demands of justice and upheld the moral

government of the universe; for God could not, by a mere fiat and act of power, sweep aside His holy law, and forgive violators out of hand. No human government could stand long on such lax principles of justice. A judge must punish the culprit, even though he may pity him and may desire to remit his punishment. How could a government endure if society were not protected and justice upheld!

It was on this account that the Son of God came and died for the sins of the world. He came out of love, and the Father sent Him out of love for the world, and out of love He became the sinner's Substitute before the holy and eternal law. Now we hold that this inherent conviction that justice must be maintained, even while love and mercy save the repentent sinner, finds all its requirements met in the expiation wrought by the Son of God.

Some relevant passages of Scripture are the following: "Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1); "But all things are of God, who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; to-wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses" (2 Cor. 5:18, 19); Christ became "a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people" (Heb. 2:17); "And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous; and He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world" (1 John 2:1, 2); "Herein is love,

not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 4:10).[8]

(7) *It meets the desire for inner purity.*

Whatever may be the depth of the expression, sincere and morally earnest people rejoice in the Biblical assurance that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." "Purify me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow" (Ps. 51:7). There is no system of human philosophy or sociology that even proposes to do this for sinful men; no ethnic religion has the power to accomplish it.

(8) *It cancels the fear of death.*

It teaches us that "it is not all of life to live, nor all of death to die"; that "death does not end all"; but that "Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:10). There is much assurance of a future life in the New Testament. For example, John 14:1-3: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me; in My Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you: I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye

---

[8] On the doctrine of the atonement cf. Schmid, *ut supra*, pp. 343-370; Hodge: *The Atonement;* Stalker: *The Atonement;* Mabie: *The Divine Reason of the Cross;* Mozley: *The Doctrine of the Atonement;* Weidner: *Soteriology;* Remensnyder: *The Atonement and Modern Thought;* Keyser: *The Rational Test*, pp. 119-138, and *A System of Christian Ethics, in loco.*

may be also." Paul is no less positive (2 Cor. 5:1); "For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Read also Acts 2:32; 1 Cor. 15:53, 54, 55; 1 Pet. 1:3-5; Rev. 2:10; 21:22-27.

The character of the future life delineated in the New Testament is worthy of consideration. There is to be the most intimate fellowship with God; heaven is characterized by great joy, perfect purity, the entire absence of night, sin and sorrow. In the book of Revelation much imagery is employed to help us to visualize the glory and beauty of the place, but in none of the figures of speech is there the remotest suggestion of impurity.

It is always represented, too, as a state of *self-conscious* existence. Each person will preserve his identity. You will be *you* and I will be *I*. It is evident, too, that the saints will know one another in heaven; for where they see face to face and know as they have been known, surely they will have the power of mutual recognition. It would hardly be a perfect place if people knew less there than they know here on earth.

Compare the Biblical portrayals of the future life with those of Mohammedanism, with its promises of sensuous pleasure; with the doctrine of reabsorption in Hinduism, in which individual consciousness and identity are swallowed up by absorption into the All; with Buddhism with its doctrine of Nirvana, leading

to final extinction of being; with Confucianism, which deals only with this little span of our earthly life.[9]

(9) *It fits into man's complex psychology.*

The Biblical system of truth correlates perfectly with man's psychical constitution. There is not a chord in his mental makeup to which it does not make a true and effective appeal when the conditions are normal.

It engages the *intellect,* for in its contents there are many things that challenge profound thought and careful investigation. True, in essentials it is plain like nature herself; but some of its doctrines require the deepest research.

Bible teaching also strikes the whole gamut of human emotion; it appeals to love, fear, hope, righteous anger, the desire for rest and comfort and the highest ethical feelings and aspirations.

Nor does it fail to engage and challenge that royal enduement, *the will,* putting it to the utmost test, reinforcing it in times of weakness, and inciting it to right choices and activities.

This teaching, finally, meets the spiritual and ethical needs of the mind; the desire to know God, to rest upon the Ultimate Reality, and to have immortal fellowship with Him and other good and happy personal spirits.

---

[9] Cf. Kellogg, as above, pp. 90-115 (a striking comparison of the eschatology of Christianity with that of the ethnic religions); Tisdal: *Comparative Religion,* pp. 102-115; *The Biblical Doctrine of Immortality,* in *The Lutheran Quarterly,* July, 1921.

While Christian truth works thus constructively on the human mind, it also corrects the errors of human thinking: the proud and arrogant temper of the intellect; the turgid and vindictive feelings; the sloth of the volitions and the fatal misconceptions of those who teach the deterministic view of the will, thus nullifying the sense of human responsibility. In brief, the chief purpose of the gospel of Jesus Christ is to restore the human mind to its normal condition and enable it to perform its normal functioning offices. In the terms of both Christian theology and psychology this means that the gospel seeks to restore the divine image in man, that image which has been lost through sin.

To conclude this important section of our study, we would ask: Is it probable that a merely human book, and especially one that makes false claims of having come from God, would prove so pre-eminently germane to all the deepest needs of the human soul? The best explanation, indeed the most reasonable and the only adequate one, is that this wonderful Book is the gift of God.[10]

---

[10] On this thesis, see G. P. Fisher: *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, pp. 89-98.

CHAPTER VIII

II. INTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).

8. The Wonderful Person of the Bible — Jesus Christ.[1]

(1) *Crucial nature of this thesis.*

Among all the internal proofs of the divine inspiration of the Bible, the picture it gives of the person and work of Christ is the most important. The crucial question is, *Could mere human wisdom have conceived and depicted such a character?* Christ is both the puzzle and the stumbling-stone of the skeptics, just as He was of the ancient Jews and Greeks. How to account for Christ by merely natural and human means—that is the enigma.

Here are some pertinent questions: Why should anyone have wanted to invent Him and thrust Him upon the world as its Lord and Redeemer? How could deceivers have conceived a character of such purity and faultlessness? How could fanatics have fabricated one who was always sober, sane and poised in his traits, speech and demeanor? If He was what the Bible claims

[1] For pertinent literature on the Person of Christ, consult the selected Bibliography. Special attention is called to Schaff, Stalker, Libbon, LaTouche, Mackintosh, Pratt, Robertson, McDaniel, Macartney, Conrad, Sloan and Warfield.

for Him, all is clear; every phenomenon is adequately explained. Otherwise He remains the insoluble mystery for science, philosophy and skepticism.

(2) *Christ's marvelous claims.*

No other man ever made such exalted claims as did Christ; no other ever made Himself equal with God; yet He was most humble and unaffected, and associated for the most part with people of lowly estate.

Let us note more particularly some of His claims: the only begotten Son of God (John 3:16, 18; 10:36); the same as the Father (John 14:9); the Messiah (John 4:25, 26; 5:39, 40); the Redeemer (Matt. 20:28); the Saviour (Luke 19:9, 10); the Sent of God (John 3:17, 34); "the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6); the forgiver of sins; the resurrection and the life; the final judge of all nations, tribes and people, the wise and the unwise, the quick and the dead; the one who has all authority and power both in heaven and on earth; the one who can always be present with His disciples and wherever two or three are gathered together in His name; the one who shall come at last upon the throne of His glory with all the holy angels with Him.

These certainly are the most amazing claims that any man ever made for himself. If they were false, how could Christ have lived so pure and unselfish a life? And why did He die a cruel death on the cross for the sake of these very claims? That surely would have been contrary to the nature of things. The most reasonable conclusion is that Jesus was what He claimed

to be. How could the disciples have fabricated a character making such claims, and then carry their conception to success?

(3) *His ethical purity.*

He knew no sin; He never confessed Himself to be a sinner; He challenged His accusers to convict Him of sin; He never repented of sin, though He bade all others repent (Luke 13:3, 5); He lived uprightly in His outward deportment, so that Pilate could find no fault in Him (Luke 23:4, 14; John 18:38; 19:4, 6); Judas said, "I have betrayed innocent blood"; the Roman centurion and those who stood with him at the cross were constrained to say, "Truly this was the Son of God" (Matt. 27:54).

Now, since He lived so noble and upright a life, and withal was so poised in character, it is hard to believe that He was either an impostor or a fanatic. It is easier to believe that He was what He claimed to be —the Son of God sent to ransom the world from sin. Neither could impostors or dupes have invented a character and life so pure.

(4) *His spiritual insight.*

No one ever lived in closer communion with God. He says that He always did the will of the Father. He spoke to Him in the most intimate terms; He taught that only truly spiritual worship of God is acceptable to Him (John 4:23, 24). Note what He said about praying to "your Father in secret" (Matt. 6:6). It is not creditable that one who lived so close to God would have been anything but honest and true. Nor could

impostors or fanatics have fabricated so spiritual a character as that of Christ.

(5) *His calmness, courage and patience.*

Enthusiasts and fanatics never possess these qualities; sooner or later (usually the former) they prove themselves to be unbalanced. But Christ never lost His self-possession, His poise or His courage. He never courted danger or persecution, yet never fled from them. There are no marks of an illy balanced nature in His teaching and conduct. Surely if He was not what He claimed to be, He would have shown some signs of weakness and confusion. If He was an invention, how great must have been the literary and ethical geniuses who invented Him! Could the humble disciples have forged such a character? What motives could have prompted them?

(6) *Tributes of skeptics.*

It is remarkable how many tributes have been paid to the excellence of Christ's character by men who were skeptical of the system of religion He gave to the world. Let us note some of them, and draw from them the legitimate conclusions. Renan: "Jesus is in every respect unique, and there is nothing to be compared with Him." J. S. Mill: "Christ is still left, a unique figure, not more unlike all His precursors than all His followers, even those who had the benefit of His personal teaching. But who among His disciples or among their proselytes was capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or of imagining the life and character revealed in the gospels? Certainly not the fisher-

men of Galilee; certainly not Paul, whose character and idiosyncrasies were of a totally different sort; still less the early Christian writers."

One cannot help wondering, after reading such acknowledgments, how Renan and Mill could refrain from becoming true, evangelical believers. There is something strange about the inconsistencies of human nature and human logic.

Strauss (author of a rationalistic life of Christ and founder of the so-called Mythical School) said: "Christ is the highest object we can possibly imagine with respect to religion, the Being without whose presence in the mind perfect piety is impossible."

Similar tributes might be quoted almost *ad infinitum* from Goethe, Matthew Arnold, Lecky, Theodore Parker, and even Diderot and Rousseau. Indeed, the last-named skeptic is the author of the well-known sayings:

"Peruse the works of our philosophers, with all their pomp and diction, how mean, how contemptible they are compared with the Scriptures! Is it possible that a book, at once so simple and so sublime, should be merely the work of man? Is it possible that the sacred Personage whose history it contains should Himself be a mere man? Do we find that He assumed the tone of an enthusiast or an ambitious sectary? What sweetness, what purity in his manner! What an affecting gracefulness in His instructions! What sublimity in His maxims! What profound wisdom in His discourses! * * * Where is the man, where the philosopher, who could so live and so die, without weak-

ness and without ostentation? * * * Yes, if the life and death of Socrates are those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus Christ are those of a God."

Robert G. Ingersoll, much given to scoffing at Christianity and often pretending to expose "the mistakes of Moses," never attempted to point out the mistakes of Christ; on the contrary, he once said, "If Christ were living today, I should delight to give Him homage." [2]

If these plaudits are true, how could Christ have been anything but what He claimed to be? How could so great and noble a person have set up a false and foolish claim that He was sent of God and was one with the Father?

(7) *Tributes of great believers.*

Napoleon: "I know men; and I tell you that Jesus Christ is not a man." Citations could be given from Herschell, Newton, Faraday, Guyot, Hugh Miller, Agassiz, Dana, Washington, Lincoln, Lord Kelvin and many others.

Surely a person who can win tributes from such men must be unique. Could a book, written centuries ago, much of it in a crude age, yet containing all the sublime qualities named by these great men, and especially setting forth so resplendent a character as Christ —could such a book be a mere human concoction or a

---

[2] Dr. Schaff in his classical work: *The Person of Christ*, made an extensive collection of tributes from skeptics, citing authors, titles and pages. Other testimonies may be found in Mullins: *Why is Christianity True?* pp. 128-135; Johnson: *Christianity's Challenge*, pp. 73-76.

tissue of falsehoods? As someone has said, "It would take a Christ to invent a Christ." We conclude, therefore, from the picture of Christ drawn on its pages, that the Bible must be more than a human book; it must be divinely inspired.[3]

9. The Apostles and Evangelists as Witnesses.

(1) *They were sincere.*

Of this there can be no doubt. No earthly advantage could accrue to them by the acceptance and advocacy of Christ and his teaching. They could win no fame, no wealth, no ease. They were willing not only to suffer, but also to die for their faith; and when they died, they died triumphantly, often rejoicing in the privilege of dying for their Lord. Men are never willing to make sacrifices for what they know to be falsehoods, nor for principles which they do not regard as of supreme importance. A noted infidel of a past generation scoffed at the martyrs of the Church, saying, "It is better to lie than to die." This proved how lightly he held the principles of truth and heroism.

The apostles could not have been imposters. It is inconceivable that imposters could have invented such narratives and doctrines as the gospels contain or such a pure and noble character as that of Jesus Christ. Imagine their getting together and concocting an imposture, and then giving to the world the purest char-

[3] Dr. Schaff's book also contains tributes from believers. The striking saying, "It would take a Christ to forge a Christ," is attributed to Theodore Parker, a well-known skeptic (see John J. Lawrence, *The Christian Credentials*, p. 61).

acter (Christ) and the purest ethics the world has ever known! Do mendacious people do such things? That would be like a pure stream flowing from a foul source.

Again, if they knew that their story was false—for example, regarding the resurrection of Jesus—how could they have ever hoped to achieve success in the circumstances that then obtained in Jerusalem? On the assumption, however, that Christ did arise, that He was the divine Son of God, that He did endue His disciples with power from on high, all is explained; a sufficient cause has been assigned for the rise and spread of Christianity. Is it not rational and scientific to accept the only adequate explanation?

(2) *They were sober, not credulous.*

Some skeptics and rationalists contend that the apostles were credulous, ready to believe almost anything. The New Testament records—the only contemporaneous records we have of their conduct—do not so represent them. On the contrary, they "were slow of heart to believe." Christ rebuked them on this account (Luke 24:25). When He foretold His resurrection, they neither understood nor believed what He said (Mark 9:32).

After His death they fell into despondency, and were not expecting His reappearance. Peter said, "I go a-fishing" (to his former employment), and the others declared that they would go with him. On the morning of the third day the women went to the tomb to embalm His dead body, showing how little they

were looking for His resurrection. When He appeared to them, they were greatly surprised and affrighted. After His resurrection the disciples were loath to believe any reports of the event even from their own number, regarding them as "idle talk" (Mark 16:12-14; Luke 24:11). They even doubted the evidence of their own eyesight (Luke 24:36-45). To a greater or less extent they were all "doubting Thomases" (John 20:24-29).

Thus it is an error to suppose that these early disciples were gullible and fanatical; indeed, they were most skeptical. They had to be convinced by the most indubitable evidence. Such evidence must, therefore, have been furnished to them, or these daunted and disheartened men and women would never have recovered their courage, and then preached Christ before a gainsaying and persecuting world. The skepticism of the apostles is a most cogent indirect apologetics for the truth of Christianity.

(3) *They were competent.*

By this we mean, not only that they were sensible and sincere, but also that they had first-hand knowledge of the events and doctrines which they proclaimed. The twelve apostles were directly associated with Christ throughout His earthly ministry, and were all witnesses of His resurrection (Acts 1:21-26); in fact, such first-hand knowledge was a *conditio sine qua non* of apostleship.

Listen to the testimony of Peter: "For we did not follow cunningly devised fables when we made known

to you the power and presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of His majesty: for He received from God the Father honor and glory when there was borne to Him a voice from the Majestic Glory, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased"; "and this voice we ourselves heard borne out of heaven, when we were with Him in the holy mount" (2 Pet. 1:16-18).

The apostle John's testimony is no less decisive: "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we have beheld, and our hands handled concerning the Word of Life * * * declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ; and these things we write that your joy may be made full" (1 John 1:14).

Thus the apostles and those associated with them saw Christ's miracles, heard His discourses, met and touched Him after His resurrection, and bore witness to these events everywhere they went. How could all of them—for there were at least one hundred and twenty in the upper room—have been deluded into thinking they had seen Christ's miracles and had met Him after He rose from the dead? And how could their delusion have made them willing to suffer martyrdom rather than deny Christ as their Lord and Saviour? Who will dare to impeach the testimony of such men?

(4) *They were without worldly power and prestige.*

With no fame, no wealth, no great learning, no army at their command, with nothing, indeed, but moral suasion and spiritual power, how could they have foisted upon the unbelieving and critical Jews, Greeks and Romans such a scheme as the Christian system? Try to imagine a band of persons like them seeking to make the people of Jerusalem believe that one had risen from the dead—one, too, who had been crucified as a felon and had been buried just outside the city walls! How could such a story gain credence in such improbable circumstances? How could there have been any hope of success?

Yet the fact is, they did succeed, winning converts immediately by the thousand, while only three centuries later their religion became the religion of the Roman empire. Remember, too, that the Christ whom they proclaimed as the world's Redeemer was without worldly power and influence; that He was poor in purse and without academic degrees; that He was put to death as a malefactor in the most ignominious way. Yet His principles succeeded, and today millions on millions of people believe in Christ and worship and trust Him as God. What is the only adequate explanation?

Now, the argument stands thus: If the disciples of Christ wrote the truth about Him in the Gospels and Epistles, they must have been divinely inspired; because, first, they could not have portrayed His char-

acter accurately without divine guidance; second, Christ promised them the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and if He was truly what he claimed to be, He must have fulfilled His promise.

Therefore the wonderful person of Christ proves the divine inspiration of the writers of the New Testament.

CHAPTER IX

II. INTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).

9. The Apostles and Evangelists as Witnesses (*continued*).

(5) *Their witness to the resurrection of Christ.*

a. There is a sense in which the whole system of Christianity depends on the fact of the resurrection of Christ. It is true, there are other facts and miracles that occupy a strategic position; but we select the resurrection because it has so frequently been made the center of attack by both infidels and liberalists.

Note the force of the argument. If men can be convinced that the miracle of the resurrection is a fact, they will need to have no doubt about the other miracles recorded in the Bible. Again, if Christ rose from the dead, He is certainly proved to be the Messiah. God, the Father, thus placed His seal upon Him as His Son. Thus we see the strategic importance of this thesis. It holds a key position.

b. Various *theories* of the resurrection of Christ have been proposed by infidels and semi-infidels, and we must examine them frankly.

(a) There is the *swoon* theory. This theory is that Christ did not really die; but simply swooned away;

then was laid in the sepulchre, was afterwards revived, and came forth and showed Himself to His disciples.

But this is an impossible view. It is not likely that Christ, who was so weak that He could not carry His cross, could have survived the ordeal of the crucifixion. When the soldiers came to break His legs, as was the cruel custom, they found Him dead, and therefore they refrained from treating Him in that way. When one of them pierced His side with his spear, blood and water flowed out, proving that His heart had been broken and serum formed. Pilate and the soldiers would have made sure that He was dead. So would Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, who buried Him.

Moreover, how could one in His weakened condition have pushed the heavy stone away from the mouth of the tomb? How could He have evaded the strong guard of Roman soldiers, to whom neglect of duty in such circumstances would have meant death? In His weak and wan condition, in need of nursing and medical attention, He never could have convinced His disciples that He was the Lord of glory and power for whom they would be willing to risk and sacrifice even their lives.

The swoon theory would also have made the apostles base deceivers, and Christ a party to their imposture. Besides, what became of Christ? Did he remain in hiding while His followers toiled and suffered for Him? No; this theory is not deserving of half the space we have given it.

(b) Next is the *vision* theory. According to this view, Christ really appeared after His death to His dis-

ciples, but only in *spiritual visions,* although they took the form of bodily appearances.[1]

Strange as it may seem, this view has been seriously advanced by some scholars. How is it to be answered? It would still involve a miracle, and surely nothing is gained by substituting one miracle for another. It would have been a piece of deception on Christ's part, for then He appeared to His disciples only in a spiritual vision, and yet conveyed to their minds the impression that He appeared bodily. The disciples were not impressionable, but exceedingly skeptical, and hence were not in a mood to see visions and mistake them for fleshly realities.

Note what Jesus Himself said "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have" (Luke 24:39). Neither will this theory account for the empty tomb. If it is true, what finally became of the body of our Lord?

(c) We note the *legend* theory. The advocates of this view contend that legends arose in Palestine some years after Christ's career was ended, and the story of the resurrection was one of these legends.[2]

Our reply is, the time was too short for legends to arise and gain such power over thousands of people as to lead them to sacrifice property, ease, comfort, position, and even life itself to promulgate them.

---

[1] Advocated by Strauss, Keim, and others; fully answered by Orr: *The Resurrection of Jesus.*

[2] Renan was the noted advocate of this theory in his *Vie de Jesus.* Abundantly dealt with by Orr, *ut supra.*

Legends do not arise in that way, nor do they have such power over conviction and life. How could a legend have produced Pentecost? How could it have converted the intimidated Peter and his fellow-disciples into fearless preachers and advocates? How could it have won the scholarly Paul? No; this theory is not adequate.

(d) The *falsehood* theory. This means that the disciples knew that their Master had not arisen, but proclaimed it as a fact, nevertheless. We have already shown this view to be impossible. There was no sufficient motive for such baseness on the part of Christ's followers. Moreover, they lived pure lives and taught pure doctrine and ethics. Pure streams do not flow from corrupt fountains. Think of it, too: if Christ's body was still in the sepulchre, why did not the enemies produce it and confound the apostles with the damaging evidence? Of all theories, the weakest and worst is that Christianity, the religion of purity and true ethics, grew out of duplicity.

(e) The theory that Christ's body was *stolen by His enemies* has been held by some objectors. In reply Dr. Amos R. Wells says: "They (the enemies) would have brought forward the body as soon as the Christians began to talk about the resurrection, and thus would have convicted the Christians of falsehood; and we should have a record of their doing so. Indeed, such a proof would have nipped Christianity in the bud." [3]

(f) Christ's body was *stolen by His disciples*, say

[3] *Why We Believe the Bible*, p. 113.

other objectors. This was also the claim of the Roman guard, suborned by the Jewish Sanhedrin. How do we answer? Dr. Wells replies thus: "By pointing to the Roman guard, for whom it would have been death to sleep at their post. And especially by pointing to the noble character of the disciples. Would John or Peter or James have connived at such a fraud?" [4] And we may add, would they have been willing to die for what they knew to be a falsehood?

c. Let us now attend to *some positive evidences* for the resurrection of our Lord.

(a) After the resurrection there were ten or eleven Christophanies (appearances of Christ): "to women and men, to solitary persons, as Mary Magdalene, to two disciples on the way to Emmaus, to the ten disciples, in the upper room, to the eleven, to the seven by the lake, to more than five hundred. They occurred in many places and in many circumstances: near the tomb, in the upper room, on the highway, by the Sea of Galilee, on a mountain in Galilee, on the Mount of Olives. It is impossible to explain away so many appearances" (Wells).[5] It is not probable that five hundred persons would have seen Christ alive at the same time if He had not appeared in reality before them.

(b) It is a significant fact that the *Christophanies ceased after a certain time.* Says Dr. Wells in his pointed way: "If it had all been a myth and superstition, it would have grown instead of diminishing with the lapse of time; but the appearances of the risen

[4] *Ibid,* p. 113.
[5] *Ibid,* p. 119.

Saviour, numerous at first, diminish rapidly during the following days, and after forty days they cease altogether with the ascension. Myths would increase in number and complexity with the growth of imagination and the passage of time." [6] In the cessation of the Christophanies we see illustrated again the principle of the divine economy of miracles.

(c) The *remarkable change wrought in the disciples* by the resurrection is a strong proof. Before that event they were weak and fearful, slow to understand and believe; afterward they were strong in faith and undaunted in the presence of authorities and crowds. Before the resurrection they lacked spiritual power; afterward they were endued with power from on high, so that their courageous testimony on the day of Pentecost brought three thousand sinners to their knees.

Nor was their access of courage and potency an evanescent enduement; it lasted with the disciples until death claimed them. Paul came last among the apostles, but the sight of the risen Lord and the gift of the Holy Spirit completely changed his life and character. It is not likely that either falsehood or hallucination would transfigure men in that way. "It is impossible to account for their changed attitude unless Christ really rose from the dead" (Wells).[7]

(d) The resurrection *was necessary to give the disciples the last assurance* that Christ was the Messiah and the Son of God. Without it they would always have been in doubt. The result proves that God saw

---

[6] *Ibid*, pp. 119, 120.

[7] *Ibid*, p. 120.

to it that they had ample proof to make them positive, fearless and potent. So we, too, knowing the resurrection to be a historical fact, need have no doubt of Christ's Messiahship.

(e) Even the *variant details* in the several evangelical narratives of the resurrection add to the proof of its reality. There are no contradictions, though not all the minutiae can be explained; but the differences of viewpoint prove that there was no collusion among the writers; rather that each of them wrote an independent account of the events as he observed and understood them. The details in each case give the narrative an atmosphere of verisimilitude, so that it is natural to feel that real occurrences are being recited. The detail about the linen clothes in which Christ was buried lying about in an orderly way, instead of being thrown about in disorder, affords added proof that the body could not have been hurriedly stolen either by His friends or His enemies. Indeed, had not a real miraculous resurrection taken place the clothes would not have been left in the grave at all, but would have been worn by their possessor.

(f) The resurrection of Christ, proved to be a historical occurrence, furnishes also *proof for the immortality of the soul.* This is certainly a logical inference. There cannot be a body without a soul; so if Christ's body was alive and ascended to heaven, His soul must also share His immortality. Indeed, it is preposterous to think of an immortal body without an immortal soul. How could the disciples of Christ have been sure of conscious immortality without the resurrection of their

Lord and Master? "He hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Peter 1:3). Of course, the resurrection also carries proof of the immortality of the glorified body. Thus man is to be finally "all immortal."

(g) One more matter should be elucidated: With *what kind of a body did Jesus rise?* Was it a body of real flesh and blood, or only a phantasmal body?

We note, first, that it was a *real* body: He showed His hands and feet, and bade His disciples to handle Him, and make sure it was Himself and not a spirit (Luke 24:39, 40); He ate food in the upper room (Luke 24:41-43); Thomas was bidden to place his hands in the wounds of his Lord (John 20:27, 28); He kindled a fire on the shore of the lake, broiled some fish thereon, and distributed food to the hungry disciples (John 21:9-13). All these facts prove that Christ's risen body was the real body that had been buried.

Yet, secondly, in *some ways it was different.* After the resurrection Christ's appearance differed in mode from those of His ante-resurrection life. He appeared suddenly, then disappeared just as suddenly. He came to His disciples in the upper room when the doors were closed. No doubt his body had undergone partial glorification. He still remained for a while in the realm of time and space in order to give His disciples sufficient assurance and proof by His appearances, and also to complete His instructions to them on the vital principles of the kingdom and His disciples' relation to it,

and to give them His last commission to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."

His status of His body lasted forty days; then He ascended to the right hand of God where he was fully glorified with the Father's own glory which they had had together before the world was (John 17:5). Of course, there is miracle in these Christophanies, but they are in beautiful accord with the best conclusions of physical science today respecting the refined and subliminal character of certain forms of material substance. The glowing rose or lily is glorified earth. A diamond is glorified carbon. The universal ether of science, if it really exists, is rare and defined beyond our sense of perception. So with the glorified body of Christ and the coming glorified bodies of His saints.[8]

We have proved the resurrection of Christ consequently to have been a fact; the system of Christianity and the inspiration of the Bible are established.

---

[8] The author cannot take the space here to explain his own special views regarding the post-resurrection appearances of Christ in connection with the scientific theory of the universal ether, often called "The Ether of Space." This view is explained somewhat at length in his work: *In the Redeemer's Footsteps*, Vol. I, pp. 186-187.

CHAPTER X

II. INTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).

10. The Conversion of Paul.

(1) *Its importance.*

The remarkable change effected in Paul's life by his conversion affords one of the strongest internal proofs that Biblical teaching and history are true, especially in their testimony to Christ. How to account for Paul's conversion has been a conundrum for skeptics and liberalists second only to the problem of Christology. If Paul's account of his own conversion is true, it establishes the truth of Christ and Christianity. Thus we see its crucial place in Christian Apologetics. It is another keystone in the arch.[1]

That powerful apologist of a former day, Lord Lyttleton, wrote: "The conversion and apostleship of St. Paul, alone duly considered, is of itself a demon-

[1] Literature on Paul's conversion: Bruce: *Apologetics*, pp. 413-429; Fisher: *The Supernatural Origin of Christianity;* Wells: *Why We Believe the Bible*, pp. 134-140; Knowling: *The Testimony of Paul to Christ;* Wilkinson: *St. Paul and the Revolt Against Him;* Faulkner: *Modernism and the Christian Faith*, pp. 167-183; Machen: *The Origin of Paul's Religion;* Robertson: *Paul, the Interpreter of Christ;* Macartney: *Paul the Man.*

stration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation."

(2) *Improbability of his conversion.*

This point is well developed by Dr. Wells: "He (Paul) was a man of exalted station and of fine education, who would naturally despise the humble and unlearned followers of Jesus. He had been trained in the strict sect of the Pharisees, who were Christ's bitter enemies. The seeing and hearing of Christ might have removed his prejudices, but he had never seen or heard Him. He became the most bigoted and powerful opponent of Christianity, persecuting, as he said, "this Way unto death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women." No man on earth would seem more unlikely than Paul to be converted to Christianity, still less to become its most ardent and successful advocate." [2]

On account of man's natural pride of opinion, it must have been hard for Paul to change so utterly and acknowledge his error before all his acquaintances.

(3) *Reality of his conversion.*

It was not merely a formal change; not one that might have been brought about by fright, or considerations of policy or even by logical processes. It was a real inner, ethical and spiritual transformation such as can be effected only in the new birth by the Holy Spirit. To this he himself bore explicit witness: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things

[2] *Why We Believe the Bible*, p. 134.

are passed away; behold, they are become new. But all things are of God, who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5:17, 18).

If his transformation was not a real spiritual change wrought by the Holy Spirit, then we must accuse him either of deliberate falsehood and hypocrisy or of foolish delusion. In view of all the facts neither supposition is reasonable. He was too noble and self-sacrificing to be an imposter, too sane and well-poised to be the victim of hallucination.

Note the ethical and spiritual features of his experience. Once a bitter persecutor, he is now a humble, patient, forgiving Christian, acknowledging himself debtor to all men. Had his change been merely an outward, mechanical one instead of ethical and spiritual, he would have still retained his malignant, persecuting temper, and would have persecuted the Jews, as he had previously persecuted the Christians. Once he was narrow and bigoted; now he is broad and generous and cosmopolitan. He had to give up much for Christ and suffer much persecution, but he did it all without complaint. Something very internal had occurred to Paul. It was a spiritual transformation.[3]

(4) *His vital doctrines.*

The doctrines he believed and taught so ardently prove that his change was wrought in a supernatural

[3] Certain liberalists have asserted that Paul was converted by being struck by a thunderstorm. To this some one has replied wittily: "If that is so, it would be a good thing if a lot of other people were struck by the same kind of a thunderstorm!"

way, and that proves the reality of Christ. He believed in the Deity of Christ; he taught that Christ fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies and was the archetype of the Old Testament types and symbols; that Christ made vicarious atonement for the sins of the world; that He rose from the dead, citing ten or eleven of his appearances, and adding his own vision of Christ on the way to Damascus; that the Old Testament Scriptures throughout are God-breathed (2 Tim. 3:16); that believers have the inner witness of the spirit (Rom. 8:15-17); that Christ "hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:10).

Surely this teaching connotes a real inner change and experience. To what else can we impute them but to the power of the risen and glorified Christ? Thus Paul's conversion and subsequent life of purity and devotion prove the truth of Christianity. And if Christianity is true, the Bible, from which Christianity is derived, must be God's Book.

11. Frankness of the Biblical Writers.

It is significant that the writers of the Bible are perfectly frank in portraying their characters. There is no attempt to idealize them, to place them on the pedestal of perfection, or to gloss their faults. This is an evidence of the pellucid honesty of the Biblical writers; they were not mere advocates; they were not trying to make out a case; they were simply and *naively* bent on telling the truth, whether it was favorable or

damaging to their cause. Where in all fictitious literature will you find a parallel?[4]

Suppose we cite examples. Noah was a righteous man, chosen of God to preserve the human race. You would think he would have been depicted in all bright colors; and he would have been had he been a hero of the imagination; but, behold, he became intoxicated and was made a humiliating spectacle. Abraham was chosen of God to be the father of His people; but twice he played the coward and told falsehoods. Jacob exhibited two most culpable faults, those of self-seeking and duplicity. A fiction writer would have made Moses a flawless hero, but the honest Biblical scribes tell us that he lost his temper more than once, and so offended God that he was never allowed to realize his highest hopes —to enter the promised land. Samuel was impatient and chided God.

And what shall be said of David? Would a writer of fiction ever have permitted his hero to fall into the awful sins of murder and adultery, after he had been lifted so high? But the writer was intent only on telling the facts. The great prophet of the Lord, Elijah, lost his courage, ran from danger and sat forlorn under a juniper tree, bemoaning his lot. So we note downright honesty everywhere; no glossing, no false coloring to gain a point!

No less striking is the honesty of the New Testament writers. They tell a very unflattering story about themselves, the very opposite of myth-mongers and

[4] On this topic cf. MacArthur: *The Old Book and the Old Faith*, pp. 226, 236; Wells, *ut supra*, p. 36.

legend-makers. All the twelve apostles doubted, were afraid, could not understand, forsook Christ in His extremity, and had to be rebuked by Him again and again; one of them betrayed Him; another, and he the chief one, denied Him with oaths. What a college of apostles, indeed, to represent Christ to the world and to carry His message to the ends of the earth!

Would a myth-maker or a fiction-writer have set forth such damaging facts? And would a conscious fabricator have done so? He might have known they would be used afterward against the imposture he was trying to foist upon the world.

This utter disingenuousness of the Biblical writers proves their integrity. Being honest, they told the simple, unvarnished truth; and if they told the truth, the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible are proved.

12. Fulfillment of Prophecy.

This is a profound and complicated subject, and we cannot give it the space it deserves. We can give the evidence only in broad lines. The argument is this: No one but God can know the future. "Who knoweth what a day may bring forth?" If, therefore, predictions have been literally fulfilled, God only could have inspired them. Then the only question is, Have any of the prophecies—or a sufficient number of them to establish a fact—been fulfilled?

Only a few outstanding instances can be cited here. "Therefore, the Lord Himself will give you a sign. Behold, a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son

and shall call His name Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14, cf. Matt. 1:23). In the account in Matthew this prophecy is expressly applied to Christ, in whom it had a wonderful fulfillment. This is especially significant when the word "Immanuel" is interpreted; it means "God with us." If this prophecy does not refer to Christ, it has no meaning; if it does, its meaning is perfectly clear.

Note again (Isa. 9:6), "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace."

Apply all these terms to Christ, and see how marvelously they fit His person and character. It is significant that this Child should be called the Mighty God; for in Matthew's gospel He is called "Immanuel, God with us." In the first chapter of the gospel according to John, He is called the *Logos* (word): "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God and the Logos *was* God."

With the doctrine of Christ in the New Testament also agrees the name, "Everlasting Father," which in Hebrew is "the Father of Eternity." Compare: "In the beginning *was* the Logos" (John 1:1); "And now, O Father, glorify thou me thine own self with the glory which I had with thee *before the world was*" (John 17:5); "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last," applied both to God and to Christ (Rev. 1:8, 17, 18; 21:6; 22:13).

So the other designations apply to the Christ of

the New Testament, and to Him only. Yet note that it says, "Unto *us a child is born*," etc. Is it not remarkable that divine names should be applied to a *child?* This seems to prove that God inspired the prophet to write as he did, knowing that He would send His Son into the world to become incarnate in human form—to become a babe and develop into a man.

One of the most instructive prophecies of the Old Testament is that of Isaiah 53, which has been termed, "a prophetic biography of Christ." An unbeliever once grew interested in this chapter, and after studying it for a time, was so impressed with its fulfillment in Christ that he renounced his infidelity and became a devout Christian. Note only a few points: "He was despised and rejected of men"—fulfilled in Christ; "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief"—fulfilled in Christ; "He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities"—fulfilled in Christ; "and they made His grave with the wicked, and with a rich man (was He) in His death"—fulfilled in Christ; "although he had done no violence, neither was deceit found in His mouth" —all fulfilled in Christ.

The parallels between the Old Testament prophecies and the related New Testament incidents are too numerous and specific to be mere coincidences. If they were fulfilled in Christ they grow with meaning; if not, they are mere vaporing and jargon. Christ Himself taught that the Old Testament prophecies were fulfilled in Him: "And beginning from Moses and all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke 24:27; also 32);

"Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and they are they which bear witness of Me" (John 5:39); "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfill" (Matt. 5:17).

Our Lord Himself made frequent predictions. Note the many things He foretold that were fulfilled: that Peter would deny Him and Judas betray Him; that He would suffer death by crucifixion (Matt. 26:2); that He would rise again on the third day; that within the lifetime of some of His hearers the temple would be destroyed and Jerusalem would fall; that His kingdom and gospel should spread through all the earth. Thus prophecy is a strong evidence of the divine origin of Christianity and the Bible.[5]

13. Biblical Claim to Inspiration.

(1) *Definition of divine inspiration.*

By this term we mean that the writers of the Bible wrote as they were moved and guided by the Holy Spirit.

Thus they reproduced God's thoughts in the language in which He desired to have them set forth. At this place we will not discuss the several theories of

---

[5] Cf. Wells, as above, pp. 44-52; Turton: *The Truth of Christianity*, pp. 99, 110, 186-200, 374-395, 434; Lyall: *Preparation of Prophecy;* Fisher: *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, pp. 447-460; Pierson: *Many Infallible Proofs*, pp. 29-78; Bruce: *Apologetics*, 176-208, 226-261, 293; Stump: *Bible Teachings*, pp. 20-23; A Keith: *Evidence from Prophecy.*

Biblical inspiration that have been advocated.[6] This subject would lead us too far afield. For Apologetics the main point is that the Bible is fully inspired.

We call this *plenary* inspiration, in opposition to the liberalists, who hold that only some parts of the Bible are inspired, or that it is only "inspired in spots." The latter view makes the Bible an uncertain book. It makes human reason, after all, the final arbiter, and that is not essentially different from the old Deism of England and the old Rationalism of Germany. We have already shown how unreliable mere human reason is as a guide in spiritual matters. The Bible, we believe, is a safer guide.

(2) *What the Bible claims for itself.*

It is true, the Bible does not say everywhere in so many words, "God said this." That would have been so repetitious as to become wearisome. But the Bible does give the general impression that it speaks the truth everywhere, and that wherever it was necessary God gave to His selected scribes special revelation, instruction and guidance.

Some Modernists say that the first chapter of Genesis

---

[6] See an admirable summary of the several theories of inspiration in Wells, *ut supra*, pp. 64-67; also cf. Cave: *The Inspiration of the Old Testament Inductively Considered;* Schmid: *Doctrinal Theology*, pp. 38-64; J. A. O. Stub: *Verbal Inspiration* (small, but very incisive); J. C. Ryle (Bishop): *Is All Scripture Inspired?* (very pointed); Gaussen: *Theopneustia: The Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scripture* (old, but acutely reasoned); Stuart: *Divine Inspiration Versus the Documentary Theory of the Higher Criticism;* Vine: *The Divine Inspiration of the Bible* (1923).

does not claim to have been inspired of God or dictated by Him. True enough; but that chapter conveys the impression that it is narrating facts, and leaves it to men's common sense to infer that no one but God could have revealed those primeval facts to man, seeing that no human beings were living until near the close of the sixth day. As soon as God had created man (Gen. 1:28-30; 2:16, 17), He revealed Himself to him, talked with him, and gave him directions for his conduct, and from then on the history is consecutive and without a break. Would not all this prove that the God of the Bible meant to give the impression that the history is true? Therefore, He must have seen to it that *some one wrote that history and wrote it correctly*.

Considering the Bible in the large, it does claim in very many places to come directly from God. Someone has made the computation that such expressions as, "And God said," "God commanded," "The word of the Lord came unto me," "God appeared unto Moses," etc., occur in the Bible fully two thousand times. Certainly the Bible is a theistic book through and through; it might be said to be *rife* with the supernatural element.

Are all these claims true or untrue? They must be one or the other. They cannot be both; nor can they be half-true and half-untrue. When the Bible says, "And God spake all these words, saying" (Ex. 20:1), they must be either true or untrue. The critics who deny the existence of Moses, or make him a "vaguely

majestic character,"[7] are doing nothing less than putting the writer of Exodus into the category of falsifiers. Their contention is primarily, therefore, with the Bible itself and its authors, not with orthodox theologians and apologists.

The New Testament many, many times bears witness to the Old. Christ never criticized the Old Testament, but treated it as if it were a true revelation from God. In many ways He deepened and spiritualized its meaning, but at no time did He reject any part of it. Indeed, He expressly declared that He came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them (Matt. 5:17). When Satan tempted Him, He quoted the Old Testament saying, "It is written," as if that were the end of debate. He criticized the Rabbinical glosses of the Old Testament, and accused the Pharisees of perverting its doctrines, putting in their stead human tradition (Matt. 15:6; Mark 7:13). Someone has aptly said that Christ's declaration, "The Scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35), was not a parenthesis with our Lord. Those who reject the Old Testament, or tear it to shreds with their critical apparatus, undermine the authority and divinity of Christ,[8] who said: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have be-

---

[7] The quotation is from the well-known liberalist, Robert Mackintosh: *Christianity and Sin*, p. 12.

[8] Cf. Noesgen: *The New Testament and the Pentateuch;* Franklin Johnson: *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old;* Burrell: *The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Scriptures;* Rouse: *Old Testament Criticism in New Testament Light;* Keyser: *Contending for the Faith*, pp. 170-201; Hodgkin: *Christ in All the Scriptures*, pp. 1-8ff; Scroggie: *Is the Bible the Word of God?* pp. 39-45.

lieved me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:46, 47).

Let us examine somewhat critically two classical passages from apostolic writing. The first one is 2 Tim. 3:16: "Every Scripture is inspired of God, and is profitable for teaching, for reproof," etc.[9] The Greek word translated "inspired of God" is *theopneustos*, which means literally *God-breathed;* that is, every Scripture comes from God as its source. To what writing (Scripture) did Paul refer? To the Old Testament, as the context shows. To prove it, read the two preceding verses: "But abide thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a babe thou hast known the Sacred Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

Did Paul have the same Old Testament canon that we have today? He did. Therefore Paul claimed divine inspiration (or a divine source, which is the same thing) for "every Scripture" of the Old Testament. That

---

[9] The author believes he has here given the correct translation. It is given in the margin of the American Revised Version. In the original there is no copulative verb, as so often occurs in the Greek; therefore, it must be supplied: The original is, *Pasa graphe theopneustos;* translated, this would be "Every Scripture is God-breathed." Then the *kai* which follows *theopneustos* can naturally be translated "and," connecting logically with what ensues. Cf. Wm. Evans: *The Book of Books*, pp. 25, 26; *The Bible Champion*, October, 1929, pp. 510, 511. This magazine is now called *Christian Faith and Life*, and is published by Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa. It stands valiantly for "the faith once for all delivered."

certainly is high authority. If the Old Testament is not all God-breathed, Paul was sadly in error.

It may be objected that the same claim is not made for the New Testament writings; but that position cannot be upheld. Everywhere the New Testament professes to give a fuller and clearer revelation of God than is given in the Old Testament, which was preparatory to the revelation in and through Christ (Heb. 1:1, 2; John 1:17, 18). Therefore, if the Old Testament is plenarily inspired, the New Testament must also be so inspired.

Moreover, Paul professed to receive his apostleship and gospel, not from men, but from God (Rom. 1:5; Gal. 1:11). He also averred that he had the Spirit of Christ. Moreover, Christ promised His apostles the Holy Spirit, who would "guide them into all truth" (John 16:13). So Paul claimed divine inspiration for himself; therefore, we have the testimony of an inspired apostle to the inspiration of the Old Testament.

The other crucial passage is 2 Peter 1:12-21. All of it should be read carefully, for it agrees with Paul, although the order of the argument is reversed.

Peter begins with the apostolic testimony, and then goes back to the Old Testament, thus connecting the two and putting them on an equality. He claims that he and his fellow-apostles did not "follow cunningly devised fables," but "were eye-witnesses" of Christ's majesty. Referring to their experience on the Mount of Transfiguration, he says, "And this voice we our-

selves heard borne out of heaven." Therefore, he claims divine revelation for the gospel he preached.

Then he goes on to say (we give the literal translation from the Greek): "So we have the word of prophecy *confirmed*." That is, the revelation which Christ made to His apostles *confirmed* the prophecies of the Old Testament. Then he says (v. 20): "No prophecy of Scripture is of its *own unloosing*"; that is, it did not come of its own accord or from a human origin; "for"—note the logic of the conjunction—"for no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but, being borne along by the Holy Spirit, the holy men of God spake." We translate as literally as we can to bring out the forceful way in which the apostle stated his thesis.

Peter's logic is clear. He places the testimony of the apostles on a par with that of the Old Testament prophets, saying that the latter is confirmed (*made sure*) by the former. Then he avers that the prophets spoke, not from themselves, but only as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. This argument spells the inspiration of the whole Bible.

Let us now draw the legitimate conclusion. The writers of the Bible often claim that their writings are divinely inspired; and this claim is made in various ways fully two thousand times. If this claim is not true, the Bible is the greatest literary and religious fraud in the world, and some forty different writers were all and severally parties to it. We hesitate to use such language, but it cannot be avoided in pursuing the syllogism to its merciless conclusion. But the Bible is the *best* Book in the world; it teaches the purest ethics,

the deepest spirituality; through its revelation God has saved millions of people from sin, doubt and despair; it has comforted the sorrowing, and put hope into the hearts of the despondent; it has turned upward the currents of civilization; it has cast upon a dying world the radiance of a blissful futurity.

But how can such a good book be a bad book? We reply joyfully it is *not a bad book; it is a good Book;* therefore, its claim to come from God must be true. And that is cause for devout gratitude to God, who has not left us in this world to grope our way in darkness.

(3) *The Biblical Canon.*

Here, again, we must condense. The problem of the canon is vitally connected with the doctrine of divine inspiration. If "all Scripture is inspired of God"; if God took the trouble to give the world such a revelation, He surely would have preserved it in its integrity. Is not that a logical, yes, a necessary conclusion? For God to have inspired men to write books for a specific and paramount purpose—that is, to teach mankind the way of salvation—and then permit those writings to be lost or corrupted, would be most absurd.

Therefore, we have reason to believe that He guided His Old Testament Church in forming the canon of the Old Testament, and His New Testament Church on gathering together the books fitted for the New Testament canon; and thus we have the whole Bible. It has proved its fitness by the salutary influence it has all along exerted and is exerting today.

Why did God *close the Biblical canon just when He did?* This question can be answered consistently with the answer to the previous question. When God had given a sufficiently clear and complete revelation for man's guidance and salvation, He wisely closed the inspired canon. More would have been superfluous; less would have been inadequate. There is a divinely wise economy of inspiration in the Bible, just as there is of miracle.

If God had continued to make special revelations, and had included them in the canon, by this time there would have been a ponderous, unwieldy library that no one could master and handle. As it is, the Bible is not too small to be adequate for man's need and not too large to be studied and handled conveniently, and carried with us to God's house or on a journey.

All these facts reveal a celestial wisdom in the forming and closing of the canon. A finished creation, a finished incarnation, a finished atonement, a finished Biblical canon—that seems to be God's consistent plan. Yet each has in it such latent potencies and possibilities that there is room for endless development, research and discovery—for infinite progress.[10]

---

[10] On the canon of Scripture note the following: Orr, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, article by George L. Robinson on *The Canon of the Old Testament*, and one by J. S. Riggs on *The Canon of the New Testament*. See also Westcott: *The Bible in the Christian Church; The Canon of the New Testament;* W. H. Green: *General Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon.*

CHAPTER XI

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS OF THE DIVINE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

1. The Proof from Experience.[1]

(1) *A Distinction.*

Insofar as Christian experience is produced by the Holy Spirit in the mind of the converted person, it is internal, that is, for the person himself; but so far as the Bible itself is concerned, it is external. To put it briefly, this proof is internal for the Christian, but external for the Bible.

(2) *Definition of Christian experience.*

By Christian experience is meant the inner witness vouchsafed to the penitent and receptive inquirer by the Holy Spirit, through the teaching of the Scriptures, assuring him of truth, pardon and salvation through Jesus Christ.

In its initial stage it comes in what is known as *conversion*, *regeneration*, or the *new birth*. Some per-

[1] Perhaps the classical work on this special branch of Christian Apologetics is Stearns, *The Evidence of Christian Experience*. Mullins devotes a large section of his work: *Why Is Christianity True?* to this subject; see also Lindberg: *Apologetics*, pp. 140-164.

sons experience a sudden and revolutionary conversion, such as came to Paul; with others, like Timothy, the experience comes more gradually, but no less clearly and fully. This inner experience becomes richer and deeper as the Christian grows in grace and in the knowledge of Christ.

(3) *Direct assurance from the Bible.*

The Bible teaches unmistakably that God will give the obedient and believing soul *positive assurance of truth and salvation.* Many opposite texts might be cited: "Ask, and it shall be given unto you; seek, and ye shall find" (Matt. 7:7-11); "If any man is willing to do His will he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from Myself" (John 7:17).

What is God's will in this connection? It is that one should ask God for light; that one should repent and believe—that is, be in a humble and receptive frame of mind. The pursuit of this pathway inevitably leads to assurance. It is like experimenting in the chemical laboratory: if the proper conditions are complied with, the result is certain; if they are not, nature will not yield her secrets. The would-be scientist cannot get H^2O in just any way, but must perform his experiment according to nature's chemical laws. Does he complain about the necessary conditions? No more should the earnest soul complain of the conditions in God's spiritual laboratory.

Another *sedes doctrinae* (seat of doctrine) is John 8:31, 32: "Jesus said unto those Jews that believed on

Him, If ye abide in My Word, then are ye truly My disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." This proves that, if the assurance does not come clearly at once—and that may sometime occur—it will grow clearer with perseverance; and that is a fact of common experience with Christians.

John 8:36 is also relevant: "If, therefore, the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed"—another statement that has been tested successfully by hundreds of thousands of earnest persons. Let the inquirer carefully ponder the following assuring passages: John 14: 16-21 (how rich in certification!); Rom. 5:1-2; 8:16-17; 15:13; 1 Cor. 2:9-10; Heb. 11:1; James 1:5-8; 1 John 5:10-12. These verses will bear the test of experiment, but it must be honestly made. The Bible is a serious book, tremendously in earnest.

(4) *The witness of the Spirit.*

Reference has already been made to this text: "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16). Of course, the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit is the *crux* of the whole matter. That He does give such inner certitude has been attested by millions of Christian people whose word cannot be impeached. The only difficulty is to get unbelievers to put themselves in the necessary attitude of mind to receive this witness.

It remains to be said in all earnestness that this inner testimony, impinging directly on the believer's consciousness, is more convincing than outward mira-

cles would be; it is, indeed, the final proof for the individual who receives it. It is at this point that God has left the gateway open for each soul to come into direct contact with Himself.

(5) *Contents of religious assurance.*

This is an important topic. Not all God's truth is revealed in this *direct* way to regenerated persons, not even all religious and Biblical truth, but only those truths that are most fundamental, namely, that Christ is the Saviour, that sin is pardoned, that salvation and immortality are sure, that the Bible is God's Word. These great truths are vouchsafed to the converted person in the beginning; the other spiritual truths and assurances follow through growth in grace and knowledge. God grants enough initially to give the soul assurance of the great foundation truths, but not so much as to encourage men to be slothful and carnally secure. Is not His way the best way?

Sometimes the fact just stated is taken advantage of by liberalists—just now known as Modernists. They hold that only a few of the fundamental truths are necessary, as, for example, believing that Christ is the Saviour. Therefore, many other things in the Bible need not be accepted. For a number of reasons we regard this position as full of peril:

a. It almost always occurs that the person who takes the above-named attitude toward the Bible sooner or later becomes lax even in his views of Christ, or at least holds hazy and indeterminate conceptions of His person and work, especially the atonement He made

for sin. Let people once become rationalistic toward the Bible, and they will be likely to think sooner or later that they can accept or reject just what they please.

b. If the view that certain parts of the Bible are not divinely inspired should become current, most people would not know what to believe, and hence would lose confidence in the trustworthiness of the Bible throughout.

We quote here from a great English thinker, Bishop J. C. Ryle: "The view which I maintain is that every book and every chapter, and verse and syllable of the Bible was given by inspiration of God. I hold that not only the substance of the Bible, but its language, not only the ideas of the Bible, but its words, not only certain parts of the Bible, but every chapter of the Book—that all and each are of divine authority." [2]

On Page 42 he quotes the following from Wordsworth on "Inspiration": "We affirm that the Bible is the Word of God and that it is not marred by human infirmities. We do not imagine, with some, that the Bible is like a threshing floor, on which wheat and chaff lie mingled together, and that it is left for the reader to winnow and sift the wheat from the chaff by the fan and sieve of his own mind."

It should be remembered that these are the deliberate utterances of ripe and profound scholars, who

---

[2] See his: *Is All Scripture Inspired?* This great bishop died in 1900, but his little book was found to be so valuable that it was issued in a new edition in 1921.

have canvassed the whole situation regarding the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.

c. It is true that the converted person does not experience directly many facts and doctrines taught in the Bible. For example, he does not experience the history of creation as recited in the first chapter of Genesis, for he was not there when the events took place. So he does not have a direct experience of man's creation (Gen. 2:7), or of his life in Eden (Gen. 2:15-25), or of his fall into sin (Gen. 3:1-19), and so on. Yet the following mode of reasoning is certainly valid.

The Christian's first experience of pardon, salvation and the new birth came through the Bible; had it not been for the Bible, he would not even have known anything of Christ and the way of salvation. Now, since his great and precious experience came to him through certain specific teachings of the Bible, he cannot believe that God would have put such transforming and divine truths into a book that is filled in other places with all kinds of crude scientific, historical and moral errors. That surely would have been mixing truth and error in a most confusing way.

Thus it seems reasonable to the converted person that, if God gave an infallible revelation of His plan of redemption in Christ, He would also be likely to vouchsafe the same kind of a revelation of the origin of the universe, of man, of sin, of the historical preparation for salvation, and so on through the whole Bible.

d. Again, the regenerated person reasons that, if the origin of man is wrapped in obscurity, a like ob-

security surrounds his purpose in this world and his destiny in the future. On the other hand, if he is sure of his origin as given in the Bible (Gen. 1:26-28; 2:7), then the logical inference is that God has created him for a worth-while purpose and glorious destiny. Is it not evident that the Bible as a whole is organic, unified, coherent? Accept it at its face value, and there are no *lacunae* in the age-long process; it is all divinely harmonious, luminous, rational and inspiring.

e. The regenerated person also reasons in this way: He has received the experience that Christ is "the way, the truth, and the life," and this came to him by the Holy Spirit through the Bible. But Christ endorsed the history of the creation of man and woman in Genesis I and II (see Matt. 19:3-8; Mark 10:2-12; cf. Gen. 1:26, 27; 2:23, 24). But if Christ is true, then, since He endorsed Genesis I and II, they must also be true.

The same method of arguments holds for the many other testimonies of Christ to the divine truth and authority of the Old Testament. He referred to Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Elijah and Jonah as historical characters, and to the deluge, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the repentance of Nineveh, and other Old Testament incidents as historical events. Therefore, if He is true, they must be true. Note one significant passage: "If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe though one rose from the dead."

f. The converted person also reasons as follows: If those Old Testament narratives are only fiction, then,

after all, no one can be sure that God cares for people as the Bible represents, because the incidents may be only the invention of someone's pious imagination; but if those incidents are factual, then he knows that God is a God who cares and intervenes for His people.

g. Moreover, a historical religion, such as Christianity is proved to be by an actual historical experience, could not come from a mythical or legendary source. Something that eventuates in history must come from history. Think of God giving men a real religion now, and yet divorcing it from the stream of history and fact! Such a doctrine is too improbable and illogical to be maintained.

(6) *Positive assurance and negation.*

Balance the value of two men's testimony: the one declares that he *has* received a religious experience, the other that he *has not* received such an experience. It would hardly be consistent for a man who has never tasted an apple to deny that it has a taste. For a person to call Christian experience a delusion, because he himself has never had such an experience, is utterly gratuitous and entirely aside of the mark.

(7) *Spiritual and sense experience.*

All assurance goes back finally to the *center of consciousness.* The experiences of sensation come in this way just as do any other psychical experiences. Men know truth only in the light of consciousness. You can know that there are trees on the college campus only because the proper sensory system has borne the

impingement back into your consciousness. You accept that experience as valid.

But suppose that God makes an impingement on one's consciousness by *a more direct and intimate way*, that is, by His own Mind or Spirit, why is not that experience just as valid and certain as when an experience comes in the roundabout way of the senses? It is pathetic to realize that many people are so steeped in materialistic ways of thinking that they can believe only in the validity of sensation, and care and know nothing about purely psychical and spiritual experiences. Christ stated a very apt and trenchant truth when He said: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit (John 3:6-8).[3]

(8) *The great "cloud of witnesses."*

Christian experience is not exceptional and isolated; millions of believers bear testimony to it as a fact. Such honest and intelligent testimony ought not to be questioned. There is a vast "cloud of witnesses" (Heb. 12:1).

(9) *Christian experience unique.*

No other religion or philosophy imparts anything like it. Regeneration is *sui generis* in the Christian

---

[3] Too many of the psychologies of the day are materialistic and earthly in their teaching. One college textbook argues that the mind is not a distinct entity, but merely the result of brain functioning, and that immortality is not possible because there can be no mental operations apart from "neurons." It is pathetic that the noble science of the human soul should thus be made to be "of the earth, earthy."

system. Who has ever heard of a system of human philosophy giving *assurance of truth, pardon and salvation?* How many moral and spiritual transfigurations in the lives of men have been effected by infidelity and rationalism? Has there ever been one?

(10) *Christian experience no delusion.*

a. Too *many honest and intelligent people* declare that they have had this experience. It is not probable that they would be unable to distinguish between chimera and reality.

b. Many people *have been changed for the better* in every way by this experience. They have been rescued from lives of uncertainty, unbelief and sin, and have ever afterward lived joyfully and uprightly. Justin the Martyr went from one human philosophy to another in search of truth, but found it only through an experience of Christ in his soul. Augustine was dissolute in his habits before his conversion; afterward he became *Saint* Augustine. John Bunyan was a wicked man, worldly and profane, before his conversion; he experienced God's saving grace, became a Christian, preached the gospel with power, was imprisoned in Bedford jail for his faith, and while there wrote his immortal allegory, *The Pilgrim's Progress.* Can infidelity produce any instances of such moral and spiritual transformation? Many other instances might be cited: Rowland Hill, John Newton, Charles Spurgeon, Dwight L. Moody, Jerry McAuley. Christianity has given the world many more "twice-born men." [4]

---

[4] Cf. Harold Begbie: *Twice-Born Men;* J. W. Mahood: *Modern Miracles of Grace.*

c. The cardinal factors of a Christian experience are of such a character as to negate the charge of delusion. Let us analyze them carefully. They are these: assurance of God's reality, personality, love and goodness; of Christ as the Son of God, sent to save mankind; of the Holy Scriptures as God's Book of truth; of pardon and salvation from sin; of the Holy Spirit's witness within the soul; of an immortality beyond this earthly life. How could such assurances be charged to mere hallucination? All of them involve a personal relation to God. Far from being vague and indeterminate, they are very definite and specific.

d. Here a question may be raised by the doubter: How do you know that it is the voice of God speaking in your soul in this experience? Our reply is: When God speaks to a man's soul, He lets him know *who* is speaking. This may be illustrated: A little child has been put to bed at night. The room being dark, he becomes frightened. He calls to his father in the next room, "Father, are you there?" Will not the father answer in his own voice to assure the child that it is he? Will he disguise his tones and assume the voice of a stranger?

Likewise our heavenly Father speaks to us in *His own reassuring tones*, and so quiets our fears and removes our doubts. Christ teaches this truth in His simile of the Good Shepherd: "When he hath put forth his own, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him; for they know his voice. And the stranger will

they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers" (John 10:4, 5). "I am the Good Shepherd; and I know mine own, and mine own know me, even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father" (John 10:14, 15).

CHAPTER XII

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).

2. Christianity's Salutary Influence.

(1) *Individual examples.*

Mention has already been made of notable conversions. Let us note further: Paul, Polycarp, Athanasius, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Luther, John Newton, Bernard, Luthardt, Christlieb, John B. Gough, Hudson Taylor, and many other twice-born men. Have infidelity and rationalism wrought such transformations? Have they not rather produced the opposite effect? All these men were made better by their conversion. They were saved from sin.

(2) *Its elevating influence on communities.*

The best civilization goes with the Bible, and the more heartily it is accepted, the more benign is its influence. In these recent years cannibal nations have become civilized through the power of the gospel. Note the work of Livingstone, Hannington, Moffatt and Day in Africa; Schwartz, Ziegenbalg, Carey in India; Judson in Burma, Paton in the New Hebrides, and many more.

True Christianity has always fostered education; not only for privileged classes, but also for all people as far as possible. Most Christian people are strong advocates of our public schools here in America, and even those who hold themselves aloof from them to some extent have schools of their own in which the young are taught. The Christian Church has established many institutions of higher education, and was the first in the field in this respect in this country. Her motto has been to place the church and the school side by side. In mission stations in all lands this policy is pursued.

Note, too, how Christianity has elevated the status of woman. Where the Christian religion prevails the woman is placed on an equality with man, and is treated with special respect. The Bible teaches that woman as well as man was created in the divine image (Gen. 1:27). Compare her status in Christian countries with her condition in Mohammedan countries and in those in which ethnic religions prevail.[1] The Bible has done much also for human liberty, literature, art, science. It has often opened the way for commerce.

(3) *Reasons for these uplifting effects.*

They are directly traceable to the Bible, which teaches love, purity, salvation from sin, duties to God and man, and imparts moral strength and spiritual vision through regeneration.

---

[1] Cf. Kellogg: *Handbook of Comparative Religion;* Marshall: *Christianity and the Non-Christian Religions Compared*, p. 44; Tisdall: *Comparative Religion;* Wells: *Why We Believe the Bible*, pp. 27, 28.

(4) *Why Christianity does not cure all ills.*

Because men do not voluntarily submit to its gracious influence nor accept the help that God offers them. Christianity will never coerce men to be good. It is a moral power, not a legal enactment. God wants no conscripts in His army. This will explain many evils in the world which would otherwise be cured by the morally potent influence of the Christian faith. If men will not take the needed medicine, they cannot be cured. God will do much for men in their trouble and sin; but one thing He will never do—invade the region of human freedom. There would have been no sense in making men moral agents if God had constantly interfered with the exercise of their liberty.

(5) *Wrongs done in the name of religion.*

A favorite argument of infidels is the wrongs done by the Christian Church in ages gone by—persecutions, thumb-screws, St. Bartholomew's Days, Spanish inquisitions, fagots and burnings at the stake.

What is the reply? All these wrongs were *contrary to the teaching of the Bible*, and were the fruits of a distorted and paganized form of religion. They were the outgrowth of natural perversion, of that depraved human nature which infidels believe to be good enough in its natural estate, and will not believe that it can and should be transformed by divine grace. Therefore, the Bible should not be charged with these cruelties. All informed persons know that they were practiced in the Dark Ages, when the Bible was largely neglected and kept from the people.

It is unregenerated human nature that is responsible for every malpractice in history. Whenever that corrupt nature has been able to become sufficiently powerful, it has established an era of ungodly dominance and persecution, whether it has exhibited its depravity in heathenism, in professed churchism or in infidelity, as in the days of the French Revolution when reason was enthroned and faith dethroned, and the River Loire ran red with the blood of martyred believers.[2]

It is to be noted that infidels never tire of expatiating on the persecutions by the Church in the Dark Ages, when the Bible was a suppressed book, and its real teaching little known and practiced; but they never mention the first three centuries of the Christian era, when the Church was in its purest state, and when its adherents suffered the most cruel persecutions for three centuries at the hands of the heathen who were the unbelievers of those bloody days.

Moreover, most of the martyrs of all times were believers, holding firmly to the Bible. They were persecuted for the sake of their evangelical faith and were not infidels.

Let us note the true teaching of the Bible, and see whether it favors persecution: "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and

[2] See Bishop Horne: *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures*, Vol. I.

the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (Matt. 5:44, 45); "The second is, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There are none other commandments greater than these" (Mark 12:31; the first commandment refers to loving God). The parable of the wheat and the tares (Matt. 13:28-30) is expressly intended to prevent persecution; for the wheat and the tares are to grow together until the last day, when God will separate them. Had professed Christians always remembered and heeded this teaching, they never would have tried to root up error by violence. Read also Rom. 12:19-21("Avenge not yourselves, beloved," etc.); 1 John 4:7-11, and many similar passages.

3. Proofs from History.

(1) *Ancient manuscripts.*

It is true, we do not have the original autographs of the Old and New Testaments. It would have been impossible to preserve them from decay and destruction without a constant miracle; and God would not have preserved them in that way, if He found that His truth could be carried down in its integrity from generation to generation in some other way.

When we come to think of it more fundamentally, we see that God's way of preserving the inspired records was the best way. Had He used a miracle to preserve certain documents, we might think that He attached special value to them as material things to be used for a sacred purpose, and thus our minds would be more impressed by mere things than by the truth.

As it is, we see that it is the *truth* that God has preserved for us, and that it is the chief thing, not a particular set of tablets or parchments or papyri. Thus one copy of God's word is just as valuable as another. God does not want us to have an antiquarian religion. The Christian religion is not a religion of antiques and relics, but of living, dynamic truth.

It should also be remembered that we do not have the original manuscripts of any of the ancient writers, nor of those of the Middle Ages, and very few even of modern times.

However, we do have many ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, and they are much older and much more abundant than those of any of the classical authors. Therefore, the New Testament is better attested than Herodotus, Homer, Plato, Caesar, and Cicero. The earliest complete manuscript of Homer belongs to the thirteenth century; of Herodotus to the ninth century, "while Virgil, Cicero, Plato, and all the other classical writers are scarcely better off, and far inferior to the New Testament in manuscript authentication" (Wells).[3]

Dr. Philip Schaff says: "In the absence of the autographs we must depend upon copies or secondary sources. But these are, fortunately, far more numerous and trustworthy for the Greek New Testament than for any ancient classic." Then he quotes Westcott and Hort as follows: "In the variety and fullness

[3] *Why We Believe the Bible,* p. 8.

of the evidence on which it rests, the text of the New Testament stands absolutely and unapproachably alone among ancient prose writings." [4] Let us see how well the New Testament is attested by ancient manuscripts:

a. *Codex Sinaiticus.* The term *Codex* is the technical name for an ancient document (plural, *codices*). This manuscript was found by the great German scholar Tischendorf, in 1859, in the convent of St. Catherine at the foot of Mt. Sinai, and is now in the British Museum at London, having been bought from the Imperial Library at Petrograd, Russia. The story of its discovery is very interesting. "It dates from the middle of the fourth century, and is written on fine parchment." [5] It contains the whole of the New Testament without any omissions together with large portions of the Old Testament in the Septuagint version.

b. *Codex Vaticanus.* This manuscript is now in the Vatican at Rome; hence its name. Its date is also the middle of the fourth century. It was found in Egypt, and is written on very fine thin vellum, said to be the oldest vellum manuscript in existence. It contains most of the Bible—indeed, all of it up to Hebrews 9:14, the rest being lost.

c. *Codex Alexandrinus.* This manuscript belongs to the fifth century, was probably written in Alexandria, Egypt, and is now in the British Museum. Dr. Schaff says that this codex occupies the third or fourth rank

---

[4] Schaff: *Introduction to the American Edition* of Westcott and Hort: *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, p. 13.

[5] Schaff: *ut supra*, p. 18.

among the New Testament manuscripts in value for the fixing of the text.

d. *Codex Ephraemi.* This document belongs to the fifth century, and contains about two-thirds of the New Testament. The works of the Syrian father Ephraem are written over it (hence its name), for which reason it is somewhat hard to decipher. It is very valuable so far as it goes. It was written in Alexandria, and is now in the National Library in Paris.

e. *Many others.* Besides these ancient codices, there are many others of more recent date. Thus we can see how rich the New Testament is in manuscript attestation.

(2) *Helps in determining the text of the Old Testament.*

a. The Hebrew *Targums* are paraphrases of the Bible which greatly aid in determining and understanding the Hebrew Text. The word *Targum* means interpretation.

b. The same may be said of the *Talmud*, which is a well-known Hebrew commentary on the Old Testament. *Talmud* means instruction. The Talmud consists of two divisions, the *Mishna*, which is the text itself (in either Babylonian or Palestinian), and the *Gamara*, which is the commentary on the text.

c. Another great help is the *Septuagint*, which is the Greek translation of the Old Testament, made in Egypt about 250 B. C.

(3) *Early translations of the New Testament.*

These are the *Peshitto*, or Syriac version, about A. D. 150.; the *Itala*, or old Latin version, 160; the *Vulgate*, the Latin translation by Jerome, latter part of the fourth century; the *Coptic* (old Egyptian), the *Ethiopic* and the *Gothic*, all of the fourth century, and the *Armenian* of the fifth. All these recensions help to confirm the truth and integrity and emphasize the importance of the New Testament as having been written and gathered into the sacred canon at an early date.

(4) *Jewish and Christian care of sacred books.*

Both guarded them with jealous care, especially in the earliest times. The Jews counted the letters and lines to make sure that no errors occurred, while imperfect copies were destroyed. Tampering with the text would, therefore, have been detected. Afterward errors and changes took place, as is evident from the variant readings in the several manuscripts, but, as has been said again and again by the most competent scholars, these variations consist mostly of mere verbal transpositions, and none of them affect in the least any doctrine or important historical fact of the Bible. Of course, through the centuries many transcriptions and translations had to be made, and in this way the various readings came about.

A noted infidel of the last century tried to throw discredit on the Bible by saying there was no printed copy of it until the fifteenth century. Of course not! No other book was printed before that time, because

the art of printing was not invented until the time of Gutenberg, who lived from 1400 to 1468. The first book ever printed with movable type was the Latin Bible; this Bible was finished by Gutenberg in 1455. Before that time all books were copied by hand, the Holy Scriptures included.

(5) *An early Syriac version.*

In 1892, another important discovery was made in the monastery at the foot of Mount Sinai by two women, Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson.[6] It was a Syriac palimpsest—that is, a parchment that had been written on more than once. These ladies were aided by other expert scholars, and the conclusion arrived at by their critical investigation was that the document must have been produced from copies of the New Testament of about the year A. D. 150, proving that at that early date our gospels were accepted by the Christian Church as the true, authoritative ones. This was only a few years after the time of the last living apostles. Again we see how well the New Testament is authenticated by manuscripts. No classical author comes near having so much documentary proof.

(6) *Testimony of apostolic and church fathers.*

The study of *Patristics* bears close upon the science of Apologetics. From the days of the apostles to the fourth century—and, of course, ever afterward—we can clearly trace the proof of the existence and

---

[6] See Cobern: *New Archeological Discoveries*, pp. 176-186; Wright: *Scientific Aspects of Christian Evidences*, pp. 228-237.

influence of the New Testament by the testimony of the early Christian writers. If this point is established, the charge that the Gospels were inventions, myths, and legends falls to the ground; the historicity of the gospel records is maintained. We shall examine some of this testimony.

a. Clement of Rome wrote about the year 100, not long after the last New Testament book, the Gospel of St. John, was written. In a lengthy letter, meant to settle a dispute among the Christians at Corinth, he cites the four Gospels, the Acts, five of Paul's letters, Hebrews, 1 Peter, James and Revelation—fourteen books and seventy-three references.

b. The Epistle of Barnabas is as old as A. D. 120 and perhaps older. It makes citations from the gospel according to Matthew, introducing one of them by the well-known phrase, "It is written," used only in citing from the Holy Scriptures.

c. "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," discovered about forty years ago, was written before A. D. 140. It contains four references to "the Gospel of our Lord" in such a way as to indicate that a written record was clearly meant. Sentences are also used that seem to be taken from Matthew, Luke and John.

d. The testimony of Polycarp is most valuable. He was a disciple of the Apostle John, became bishop of Smyrna, and died as a martyr in 165. A letter written by him contains definite citations from the New Testament, proving that at least a part of it was in circulation in the Christian Church at the time.

e. Papias was a contemporary of Polycarp, probably conversed with the apostles, and certainly knew some of Christ's own immediate followers. In a book on Christ's teachings he informs us that Mark wrote his Gospel from what Peter told him, and that Matthew first wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. This proves that in his day those Gospels were in existence.

f. Justin Martyr was a convert to Christianity from heathen philosophy, and a learned scholar; he died as a martyr in 166. In his three defenses of Christianity (previously referred to) he made two hundred references to and citations from the New Testament. He quotes from all four of the Gospels, which he calls "Memorials of the Apostles." A significant detail is this: In one place he speaks of a fact concerning Peter, which he says came from "his (Peter's) Gospel"; the incident is recorded in the Gospel of Mark, who, according to Papias (see above), obtained his information from Peter. How beautifully the testimony of the fathers agrees!

g. Most valuable is the witness of Irenaeus, who was born in the first quarter of the second century and became bishop of Lyons in 177. In his earlier years, while he still lived in Asia, he was associated with Polycarp, who, as we have seen, was a disciple of John the apostle. He also says that he knew other disciples whom the apostles had taught. "In his writings Irenaeus speaks of the four Gospels as having existed from the time of the apostle, and gives definite account of the origin of each of them, mentioning their writers by name" (Wells).

h. Similar testimony might be cited from Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian of Carthage, with many other writers down to the year A. D. 400. "Indeed," says Dr. Wells, "if the New Testament had been entirely destroyed about the year A. D. 400, it might be almost completely recovered as cited in the pages of the early Christian writers."

Compare the numerous quotations from the New Testament with the scarcity of quotations, contemporary or subsequent, from secular authors. The historian Rawlinson says: "It is of very rare occurrence for classical works to be distinctly quoted, or for authors to be mentioned by name, within a century of their publication." "Herodotus is said to be cited only once in the first century, once in the second, not at all in the third, and twice in the fourth. The first quotation from Thucydides is two centuries after his history was published" (Wells).

i. Other early citations might have been made had space permitted. They can be barely mentioned here: the *Apology* of Aristides (125); Tatian's *Diatessaron*, meaning "the book of the four," a merging of the four Gospels into one consecutive narrative (about 125); the *Gospel of Peter* (also about 125); and the *Muratorian Canon* (about 175).[7]

---

[7] Wright: *Scientific Aspects of Christian Evidences*, pp. 207, 220-243. The Muratorian Canon was found over 150 years ago in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, by Muratori, an eminent Italian scholar. It is "a fragment of a catalogue of the books of the New Testament, with brief remarks," etc. It shows that the four Gospels and other New Testament books were in existence at an early date, and were accepted as authentic.

(7) *Witness of early secular writers.*

a. Josephus (born A. D. 37), the Jewish historian, refers to Jesus as Christ or Messiah, speaks of His marvelous miracles and teaching, says He was crucified under Pontius Pilate and that He rose from the dead. He also refers to John the Baptist and to James, the brother of Jesus. All attempts to prove these references to be interpolations have failed.

b. Tacitus informs us that Nero charged the Christians with burning Rome, in order to clear himself from the crime. This proves that there must have been many Christians in Rome in Nero's time (A. D. 37-68), which must have been during the lifetime of most of the apostles. Then what ground can there be for denying that Christ lived, as some of the most radical unbelievers have been doing within the last few years?[8] Tacitus also refers to Christ as having been crucified by Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberius.

c. Pliny the Younger (52-114) wrote to his emperor (Trajan) from Bithynia, of which he was proconsul in the years 106-108, about the numerous Christians in that province who were undergoing fierce persecution for the sake of their faith. We summarize Pliny's statements: The Christians were numerous in Bithynia; they were of every age and rank and of both sexes; their influence was so great that the heathen

---

[8] Cf. W. St. Clair Tisdall: *Mythic Christs and the True* (1909); T. J. Thorburn: *The Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels* (1916); E. Worcester: *Was Jesus an Historical Person?* (1926).

altars were almost deserted; after the most searching investigation he found no vices among them; they were being persecuted only because they were Christians, not on any charge of crime; they held meetings at which they sang hymns of praise to Christ, made vows to live righteously, and partook of a "harmless meal," evidently the Lord's Supper.[9]

d. The infidels, Celsus, Lucian and Porphyry, constantly refer to the Old and New Testaments as if they were in existence in their day and were the accepted standards of the Christian Church.

---

[9] Cf. Turton: *The Truth of Christianity*, pp. 417, 418; Schaff: *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. II, pp. 68, 88, 202, 222.

CHAPTER XIII

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).

4. Proofs from Archeology.

(1) *Character and abundance of the evidence.*

So much archeological discovery confirmatory of the history and doctrines of both the Old Testament and the New has become available that we can give only a sketch. Many volumes have been written on the subject.

(2) *Specific instances.*

a. Many nations have traditions of the *creation of the universe*, some of them, especially those of Babylonia, corresponding in a number of particulars with the Genesis narrative of creation. No nations have yet been found with a tradition to the effect that they have descended from the simians or any other bestial stock, or from any of the lower forms of life. There are adumbrations here and there in ethnic religions that men were made in the image of God or of the gods. These traditions are most significant, and are evidently derived from the fact and revelation of the original divine creation. Besides two legends of cre-

ation,[1] the Babylonians have a legend of the Sabbath and one of the fall of man, the latter with striking agreements with Genesis 3.[2]

Yet these pagan stories are so mythological, crude, absurd and polytheistic as to make it unreasonable to believe that the Hebrews "borrowed" from the Babylonians. It is much more logical to assume that Genesis gives the true original account of the creation and the flood and that the *pagan myths* are the later recensions and corruptions. How could the Hebrew writer rinse the heathen stories of all their superstition and polytheism, and give a purely monotheistic account? To our mind, it would be an absurd way for the Biblical scribe to borrow from heathen sources, and then be divinely inspired to write the truth. An original revelation of the truth is much more probable and reasonable.

b. Most nations have a tradition of a *vast and destructive flood.* The Gilgamesh poem contains incidents remarkably like those recorded in the Bible respecting the Noachian deluge.[3] The Biblical event affords an adequate source for this almost universal tradition. Yet in this case, too, the Biblical account is free from the childish mythological elements that so largely mark the pagan stories. So here, again, "borrowing" is out of the question.

---

[1] Cf. Barton: *Archeology and the Bible*, pp. 235-257 also another account of the creation and the flood, written at Nippur before 2000 B. C., pp. 278-282.

[2] *Ibid*, pp. 258-263.

[3] *Ibid*, pp. 273-277; also an account of *the patriarchs before the flood*, pp. 264-272.

c. The famous *Code of Hammurabi*, discovered at Susa, Persia (the Shushan of the Book of Esther), contains 248 laws formulated by this king of Babylon about 2250 B. C. This was at the time of Abraham. It indicates precisely the state of civilization portrayed by the Bible for those times. It contains some laws remarkably like those given by Moses on Mount Sinai; yet Moses lived about a thousand years later.

Infidels and negative critics were formerly wont to aver that writing was not yet known in the time of Moses, and that the Decalogue was far too advanced in its moral standard for his day. Both these asseverations, once made with so much flourish, have been disproved by the discovery of the Code of Hammurabi and other ancient monuments containing writings and laws. This Code proves that writing was common centuries before Moses. "The Mosaic Code," however, was "not borrowed from the Babylonian." [4]

d. The *Tell el Amarna Tablets* were found in 1887 and are cuneiform inscriptions and writings dating about 1400 B. C. They represent the status of affairs

---

[4] Barton, as above, pp. 313-341; Grimme: *The Law of Hammurabi and Moses* (a convincing book); Davies: *The Codes of Hammurabi and Moses;* Kyle: *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments*, pp. 202-209; see other works in the Selected Bibliography. Two valuable recent books by eminent archeologists are Edouard Naville: *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh); Albert T. Clay: *The Origin of Biblical Traditions* (Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.). Dr. Clay shows clearly that the narratives and laws of the Pentateuch could not have been derived from the Babylonian myths as their source. For a somewhat extended argument showing that the Biblical writers did not borrow from pagan sources, see the Author's book, *A Reasonable Faith* (1933), Chap. VIII.

in Egypt and Palestine precisely as they are set forth in Genesis and Exodus. They prove, too, that there was much writing in the days of Moses; therefore, that he could easily have written the Pentateuch.

e. The *City of Pithom* has been found in upper Egypt. It corroborates the narrative regarding the Israelites having been compelled by their Egyptian taskmakers to "make bricks without straw." In some parts of the store-chambers in that city there are bricks with good straw; in courses higher up, bricks with only stubbles; still higher up bricks without straw, but sometimes bound together with sticks. Unlike the usual Egyptian custom, the walls were built with mortar, showing that alien people built them. This is a wonderful corroboration of the Biblical history.[5]

f. The discovery of the Hittites confirms the Bible. Until recently nothing was known of these people outside of the Bible, and this fact gave unbelievers and critics a chance to try to discredit its historicity. But archeology proves that the Hittites were a numerous and powerful people, with quite a long history, again vindicating the Biblical records.[6]

g. What other archeologists have done to prove the Old Testament to be consistent and historically reliable, Sir William Ramsay and Dr. Camden M. Cobern

---

[5] Turton: *The Truth of Christianity*, p. 144; Kyle: *Moses and the Monuments*, pp. 155-157. Dr. Kyle himself examined the ruins of Pithom; he also cites the first-hand reports concerning these bricks given by Naville and Edwards, the well-known Egyptologists.

[6] Cf. Kyle: *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments*, pp. 104-106; Barton, *ut supra*, pp. 69-82; Wells: *Why We Believe the Bible*, pp. 23, 24.

have accomplished for the New Testament. Many historical, geographical and social representations in the Gospels and Epistles have been found to be correct. Ramsay has especially established the reliability of Luke as a historian; indeed, he has found Luke to be more trustworthy than the secular historians. Not an anachronism has been found in the Biblical histories.[7]

h. Much confirmation of *the Biblical account of the origin and history of mankind* has come from the researches or archeologists. The Bible teaches clearly that man, as created in the image of God, was immediately endued with a considerable degree of intelligence and with moral agency or free choice, was placed in a garden where he might have a favorable environment and a fair chance for his life and the development of moral character. It seems reasonable, and inspiring, too, to believe that God would thus deal with a sentient and rational person whom he brought into being.

Although the Bible teaches that man fell into sin through the wrong use of his power of choice, yet God did not desert him, nor deprive him of his psychical enduements, but, in spite of some punishment still followed him, cared for him and tried to win him back to the way of righteousness.

Thus man, endowed with intelligence and given a fair chance, was capable from the start of a con-

[7]Cf. Ramsay: *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament;* Cobern: *The New Archeological Discoveries;* Robertson (A. T.): *Luke, the Historian in the Light of Research.* Dr. Cobern brings out the fact that, since 1912, over seventy discoveries in archeology go to prove the genuineness of the New Testament.

siderable degree of civilization; soon he could build cities, work in brass and iron, and make musical instruments (Gen. 4:17, 21, 22). Along the line of Seth there were righteous people who cared for God and did His will, as, for example, Enoch, Methuselah and Noah. When a flood was threatened, Noah and his sons had sufficient mechanical intelligence to build a great ship called the Ark. After the flood many great cities were soon built, and man was quite inventive.

There is no hint in the Bible that man came up by an age-long process from the ooze and the slime, through mollusks, worms, reptiles, birds and apes or from the same stock as the simians. According to the Bible man was directly created in the divine image, and was placed in a garden, not in a jungle. He was a man, not a brute nor a near brute.

There is much evidence in the discoveries of archeology to confirm the teaching of the Bible. In many ancient nations are found the remains of a high state of civilization. Note the vast cities and wonderful monuments whose remains have been exhumed in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Ur of the Chaldees, Turkestan; in Mexico among the Aztecs; in Central America among the Toltecs; in Peru among the Incas. According to Sayce, the noted archeologist, the civilization of Egypt even in the time of Moses was partly decadent, having reached its golden age some centuries prior.

In all the places mentioned the people today are far inferior to their ancestors who lived there many centuries before Christ. As to the cave-men in Europe, it is reasonable to believe that they were degenerate

people who moved from the great centers of civilization in central Asia and northeastern Africa. If the people of civilized countries deteriorated, as we have just seen that they did, why should not the people who moved far away into the "hinterlands" of Europe also deteriorate?

In Africa almost every tribe furnishes clear evidence of having descended from an enlightenment superior to their own; this is proved especially by their languages, which are constructed on grammatical principles which the natives themselves do not understand, but which educated missionaries are able to decipher.

In our own country we have many proofs of the decline of people whose ancestors, some generations ago, moved into isolated regions remote from civilization and Christianizing influences. It is only where certain uplifting factors, like Christianity coupled with education, are at work that mankind advances. Even with all our boasted present-day enlightenment and progress, we must admit that some of the wonderful "lost arts" of the ancient civilizations have never been recovered. We have not yet found out the architectural and engineering secrets of the erection of the pyramids of Egypt.

Our reasoning is this: The Biblical representation of man's good start in the world and the high civilization he attained in ancient times agrees precisely with the findings of archeology along the same lines.[8]

---

[8] Many works might be cited here, but we refer the reader to our Selected Bibliography under the captions: "The Bible and Archeology" and "Science and Philosophy."

i. The same truth obtains in regard to religion. The most recent researches indicate that the further back any religion is traced towards its primal source, the purer it becomes. This is true in Babylonia, Egypt, India, Burma, Ceylon, Tibet, China and many other countries where thorough investigation has been made. There is no evidence anywhere of a people having risen by their own efforts from fetichism to polytheism, then to henotheism, and finally to monotheism. Wherever such transformations have occurred—and they have—they have been effected by the introduction of an outside influence, namely, Christianity.[9] Again these facts synchronize with the teaching of the Bible.

---

[9] Cf. Kellogg: *A Handbook of Comparative Religion*, pp. 158-160; Fairbairn: *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, p. 12; Orr: *The Christian View of God and the World*, pp. 409-414; Tisdall: *Christianity and Other Faiths; Comparative Religion;* Valentine: *Natural Theology*, pp. 194-208; Colgrave and Short: *The Historic Faith in the Light of Today*, pp. 61, 62; LeRoy: *The Religion of the Primitives*, pp. 16-24, 40-43; *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, Vol. LIV, 1922, pp. 200-222; Keyser: *The Problem of Origins*, pp. 245, 246.

CHAPTER XIV

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).

5. Proofs from Biblical Criticism.

(1) *Definitions.*

a. *Of Lower Biblical Criticism.*

This is the scientific investigation of the ancient manuscripts and the original languages, in order to determine as nearly as possible the correct text of the Holy Scriptures. In other words, it is a scholarly effort to get back to the original inspired autographs of the Biblical writers. It is also known, and very properly, as Textual Biblical Criticism.

b. *Of Higher Biblical Criticism.*

This is historical and literary research regarding the origin, trustworthiness and authorship of the Bible and its various parts or books. Sometimes this discipline is known as Literary and Historical Criticism. No name that has been given to it is entirely satisfactory, because it covers so wide a scope and so great a range of investigation. The name Higher Criticism was given to it by Eichhorn, the German Biblical critic, about the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The division into Higher and Lower Criticism does not mean that the latter is of an inferior kind or

quality of investigation, but simply that it *precedes* the Higher and *forms its basis.*

(2) *Legitimate Biblical Criticism.*

There is a legitimate Biblical criticism. The word "criticism" in this connection, however, has the scientific and technical meaning. It does not mean fault-finding, but thorough-going research. When we speak of "literary criticism" as applied to general literature, we do not mean the mere finding of flaws, but the proper appreciation of beauty and merit.

In true Biblical criticism evangelical scholars believe as much as do the radicals and liberalists. What we want is the truth, which can be discovered only by the most careful and diligent investigation in matters of history and literary structure. Our own observation proves that evangelical scholars are just as judicious and thorough-going in their researches as are others.

Thus evangelical preachers and teachers should always distinguish between Biblical criticism *per se* and *the radical, negative* and *destructive* type of criticism.

(3) *Criticism and Scholarship.*

It must not be thought that the "negative" or "radical" or "destructive" or the so-called "mediating" criticism of the Bible has won the day in the realm of scholarship. True, the claim of a monopoly of scholarship has often been made by the liberalists; but such boasting proves their own lack of thoroughness and their unwillingness to examine both sides of the question at issue.

No matter from which side it issues, the boast of superior scholarship is to be regretted. It does not accord with the Christian grace of humility. No real scholar will brag of his erudition. Knowledge is a relative matter. Some people know more and some less, but no one knows a great deal. To those who hold themselves up with a superior mien we would recommend the reading of the following opposite passages of Scripture: Ps. 147:6; Prov. 13:10; 15:33; 16:18; Matt. 5:5; Luke 14:11; Rom. 12:16; 1 Tim. 3:6; 1 Pet. 5:5; Jas. 4:10.

The so-called "assured results" of the dismembering critics of the Bible have been shown again and again to be far from "assured," and the traditional or orthodox view has been vindicated by facts that cannot be gainsaid and logic that cannot be refuted. No greater and more serious mistake can be made than to suppose that the whole trend of modern scholarship is on the side of liberalism. The conservative scholars of the day are numerous, capable and outspoken, and have been so ever since the rise of the liberal propaganda. Should anyone doubt the truth of this assertion, we refer him to the extensive list of evangelical works in our Selected Bibliography at the close of this volume. Surely such a catalogue is impressive, and ought to make even the liberalists pause and take notice.

(4) *The Mediating Criticism.*

Attention should be given at this point to the so-called "mediating" Biblical critics. Their purpose seems to be to mediate between the radical views of

Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen, etc., and the evangelical viewpoint. They accept the premises of the dissecting critics and yet seem to think that they can salvage enough of the Bible and Christianity from the *debris* to prevent their total destruction and even to maintain their sufficiency as a sure guide in matters of religion. To cite a conspicuous example, Dr. S. R. Driver, in his book, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (revised edition, 1913), held that his critical view did not annul Biblical inspiration; rather it showed how God inspired the Bible; it was a question of the *mode* of inspiration, not the *fact*. Indeed, he declared that these critical views take the inspiration of the Bible "for granted."

To these contentions we must give some consideration. Take Driver's own case. What he says about inspiration is said only in the introduction of his book. In the body of the book inspiration is not even mentioned, and no effort is made to uphold it. On the contrary, the author begins his labored discussion by pointing out that there are contradictions (p. 8) between Genesis 1 and 2; then he proceeds to show that all along the history there are irreconcilable discrepancies, which can be explained only, he contends, on the theory of composite authorship—that is, many writers had a hand in the composition of the Bible, and the redactors (editors) did not always harmonize the variant stories.

Now let the reader think clearly for a moment. What kind of divine inspiration would that be which would cause, or even permit, the Holy Spirit to con-

tradict Himself? If the Bible is full of errors and contradictions, it cannot be divinely inspired.

However, to guard the truth properly at this point, we hold that there are no real discrepancies in the Bible. At first sight there may seem to be some, but judicious and thorough investigation removes them. Our point here, however, is that the position of the mediating critics is inconsistent; it cannot be maintained at the bar of reason. Their views greatly injure, if they do not entirely destroy, confidence in the divine inspiration and authority of the Book of God.

A certain class of liberalistic critics seems to accept the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ; at least they call Him Lord and Saviour; they want to be called evangelical, and they resent being termed heretical. We ought honestly to consider their claims. The facts are these:

Although they profess to stand on evangelical ground regarding the person of Christ, yet there are portions of the Bible which they will not accept as the veritable Word of God, but which they treat as myth, legend, allegory, folklore, human tradition, primitive belief and pious invention—almost anything but inspired truth. But Christ endorsed the Old Testament again and again; how, then, can they believe in His Deity and Redeemership? For if *they* are correct in their view of the Old Testament, *He* must have been mistaken.

The liberalists also hold loose views regarding the New Testament, accepting only what approves itself to their reason. But it is difficult to see how they

can obtain a true and complete view of Christ when they reject large portions of the only records we have of His birth, person and work. Thus, with all their boast of reason and critical acumen, they are illogical; it is not the real Christ of the Bible and of history whom they accept, but a Christ of their own construction. In such a case each man has his own Christ, according to his subjective views, and the world has no real universal Saviour. To reject certain parts of the New Testament records means to cast uncertainty upon all of them.

To prove that the above statements are true, press these critics to the wall, and compel them to define their doctrine of Christ, and they will have to admit, at least in most cases, that they do not hold the full evangelical doctrine set forth in the Bible and accepted by ecumenical Christianity. To specify, they do not accept *ex animo* the virgin birth of Christ, His Deity, the vicarious atonement he wrought for the world, His resurrection and ascension, and other doctrines clearly taught in Holy Writ. No; you cannot divorce Christ and the Scriptures; they are indissolubly bound up together. Either the Sacred Scriptures give a true and trustworthy delineation of Christ, or we have no trustworthy account of Him, and, therefore, have no real objective Saviour.

(5) *Reference to Bibliography.*

In this place it is impossible to reply to all the contentions of the liberal critics or to present all the positive arguments of the conservatives. To do this

thoroughly would require volumes. Readers who are interested in the said critical problems are referred to the numerous books on Biblical Criticism cited in our Selected Bibliography.

6. Proofs from the Principle of Causality.

This principle is that *every effect or event must have an adequate cause*. This is a self-evident proposition, like an axiom in mathematics. Let us apply it.

Christianity and its many institutions are here; how shall we account for them? Apparently the means employed for its propagation were very weak. Humanly speaking, the Jews were not a powerful or influential people. They were enslaved in Egypt for several centuries, and at last, after a checkered career as a nation, they were carried into exile, and finally their nationality was destroyed by the Roman armies. Yet the religion they received and taught has come down to us and its influence, especially as enlarged by Christianity, is the greatest moral and religious force in the world today; while that of the powerful nations which surrounded them is unknown save as we gather the data from books or exhume them from old ruins. Why this difference?

Christ was of humble nationality and birth; He had no wealth or worldly power at His command; He forbade the use of arms and force to promulgate His religion; His immediate followers were humble and comparatively unlearned people; contrast His position with that of Caesar, and His religion with the almost universal paganism of His day. Remember

also how bitterly Christ and His disciples were opposed by Jews and Gentiles. And the Founder of the Christian religion was crucified as a malefactor, crucifixion being the Roman mode of capital punishment for treason at that time.

Yet in three centuries Christianity, thus founded in apparent weakness and futility, had become the dominant religion of the Roman Empire, and ever since has gone on its conquering way in spite of persecution, yes, even in spite of the weaknesses of its own adherents and the many traitors and defaulters in its own ranks. Today it is the most potent influence for good in the world, and commands the allegiance of millions of people, many of them scientists, philosophers, statesmen, men of vision and practical affairs.

Are myths, legends, allegories, tendencies or any other natural means an adequate cause for all these marvelous effects? Our answer is, No! On the other hand, if the Bible *is* God's Book and Christ *is* the Redeemer of the world, a sufficient cause for the grand effect has been assigned. Since no other adequate cause can be found, ought not men of learning, science and philosophy to accept the only adequate hypothesis? Why hunt about for obscure causes when there is a sufficient one right at hand?

Here we give space to a pertinent quotation from a literary scholar, who is not a professional theologian.

"It is foreign to our purpose to discuss the various theories which have been advanced to explain the genesis and power of the Christian religion, from the cyn-

ical Gibbon to the sentimental Renan and the rationalistic Strauss. One remark may be permitted. It has been our lot to read an immense amount of literature on the subject; and, with no bias in the orthodox direction, we are bound to admit that no theory has yet appeared which, from purely natural causes, explains the remarkable life and marvelous influence of the Founder of Christianity."

7. Proof from the Integrity of the Bible.

By *integrity*, as has been said before, is meant that the Bible has been kept intact, free from essential error since it was originally written by inspired penmen.

The proof lies in this fact: The Bible has been copied and translated many times and there are from ancient times to the present many manuscripts of the whole or parts of the Bible; yet in spite of all this varied history, every essential fact, doctrine and historical event recorded on its pages has come down to us intact. This fact is most remarkable, and can be explained only on the basis of special divine care and guidance.

Indeed it would have been unreasonable for God to give a special revelation for the guidance and salvation of the world, see to its being written and collected in book form, and then fail to preserve it throughout the ages. He has preserved the human race during all time since its genesis; He has preserved the inorganic world from disintegration, life from destruction, and the varied species of plants and animals true to their type. By analogy it is credible that He has also preserved His revealed Word.

8. Proofs from Genuineness.

(1) *Definition and principle.*

By *genuineness* is meant that the books of the Bible were written by the authors to whom they have been ascribed.

On this subject volumes of great erudition have been written, and are still coming from the press. We cannot amplify, here, but must refer the reader to a number of valuable books in the Selected Bibliography.

(2) *Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.*

We pause, however, to dwell for a few moments on one point. Many strong reasons have been given by capable scholars for the belief that Moses wrote the greater part of the Pentateuch. Let us suggest a few reasons.

a. It is the traditional view, and has come down to us in almost undisputed succession from the time of Joshua. The Jews believed it before and at the time of Christ; our Lord and His apostles believed it; since their time almost all Jews and Christians have believed it. These facts count strongly in its favor.

b. If Moses wrote the Pentateuch, the Biblical history and doctrine are consistent throughout; otherwise the Bible becomes more or less of a hodge-podge, many of its direct statements must be denied outright and thus its integrity and credibility fall to the ground. Let the reader take a good Bible concordance and find the many references to the books and laws of Moses in the rest of the Biblical books, Old and New Testa-

ments, including the testimony of Christ and His apostles, and see how absolute was the consensus of all of them regarding the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Such unanimous testimony stretching over the centuries cannot be lightly brushed aside.

c. Archeology proves that there was much writing in the time of Moses; therefore it would have been both a physical and psychological possibility for him to write the book.

d. According to the Biblical record, Moses was an educated man, trained in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, who themselves had a vast literature; therefore, it is more likely that he would have been selected to write the Hebrew records than any one else of his day or subsequent to it.

e. It is far more probable that a genius like Moses would have written the Pentateuch than that some unknown person or persons would have produced it, and then would have crept into hiding, disappear completely from all historical record, Biblical and otherwise, and permit the whole credit to be given to a man who had written nothing or very little. To deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch creates more difficulties than it solves.

For these reasons, and many others both internal and external, we believe that Moses is rightfully named as the author of the Pentateuch. It is not necessary to assume that he wrote it all with his own hand; scribes may have aided him; but he evidently had editorial supervision over its composition. Nor need we assume

that he wrote the last chapter of Deuteronomy describing his own death and burial; for afterward Joshua took up the work of leadership, and may have easily added that chapter,[1] and then continued the history throughout his own life.

f. There is no direct internal or external proof that Moses had any documents before him when he wrote Genesis; he may have had. Writing was in vogue long before the time of Abraham, and records of some kind may have come down to Moses. This is only a reasonable guess. Moses might have been inspired as a compiler and editor just as well as an original composer.[2] The Pentateuch is not a collection of literary bric-a-brac, but bears the marks of unity of authorship, historical continuity, and divinity of purpose and plan.[3]

(3) *Genuineness of other books.*

On the genuineness and unity of Isaiah, see Dr. George L. Robinson's work referred to in the Selected

[1] Anyone who will read the touching narrative of the death and burial of Moses (Deut. 34:1-6) and the rest of the chapter without bias, must realize that some survivor wrote it in loving memory of the departed leader. Even then the record must have been divinely inspired, for there was no human being besides Moses present on Mount Pisgah when he died and was buried.

[2] The following scholars uphold the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch: Hengstenberg, Keil, Franz Delitzsch, Christlieb, Cave, Robertson, Orr, Sayce, Grimme, Hommel, Naville, Urquhart, McKim, Redpath, Griffiths, Green, Bissell, Bartlett, Moeller, McGarvey, Kyle, Wiener, Finn, Duncan, Pilter, Yahuda. See the titles of their works in the Selected Bibliography.

[3] Cf. Kyle: *The Problem of the Pentateuch*, p. 248. The entire book is a masterly, and, to our mind, a convincing, argument for the single authorship of the Pentateuch. See also F. E. Spencer: *Did Moses Write the Pentateuch, After All?;* A. H. Finn: *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch* (brochure).

Bibliography; on Daniel, see Dr. R. D. Wilson; on the Gospels, Turton, Mullins, Vedder, Wells, Robertson; on the Acts, Ramsay and Robertson; on the Epistles and Revelation, consult the articles *in loco* in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* and Davis' *A Dictionary of the Bible;* on the Pauline Epistles and Theology, see J. G. Machen's *The Origin of Paul's Religion* and A. T. Robertson's *Paul, the Interpreter of Christ.*

CHAPTER XV

III. EXTERNAL PROOFS (*continued*).

9. Proofs from Physical Science.

(1) *Love of science.*

In another division of this work (Part IV) we shall give some further details on this thesis. Just now we are concerned to say that all men ought to love natural science. It is proper to reject "science falsely so called," but it is never right to scoff at science *per se*. Does not true science seek to "think God's thoughts after Him"? Is not the whole cosmos God's handiwork? What could be more inspiring than to study it with such a thought in mind? No man ought to be more interested in science than the Christian; for he believes that God made everything, and made it good. Science is knowledge validated and classified. Can any scholar object to such research?

(2) *The Bible and the scientific realm.*

The Bible frequently touches on the various realms of scientific inquiry. The saying that the Bible is "only

a book of religion," is wrong. The proper statement is that its *chief purpose* is religious, but since its religion is a practical religion, intended for this world as well as the next, it goes hand in hand with historical and scientific development. It should never be relegated off to one side of the life and thought of the world; as if it were a sort of luxury for recluses. No; it touches science vitally in many ways from beginning to end, and will not be divorced from its divinely appointed companion. The very first verses of the Bible relate it vitally to the natural sciences: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth; and the earth was unformed and empty," etc.

(3) *No conflict between the Bible and science.*

Although we cannot amplify the argument here, we desire to record it as our earnest conviction after many years of earnest study that there is no conflict between the Bible and true science. Of course, wrong Biblical interpretations and mere speculations of scientists may not agree. One would not want them to agree. Many of the foremost scholars of the day, in the spheres of both physical and theological science, have shown how beautifully and wonderfully the legitimate inductions of natural science and the teachings of the Bible coincide. For example, the progressive process of bringing the world into a habitable state as set forth in the first chapter of Genesis corresponds precisely with the order of events determined by geology.

But empirical science has not proved the theory of

spontaneous generation,[1] nor the transmutation of species, nor the evolution of man from the same stock as the simians[2]; nor does the Bible teach those views. Unproved hypotheses should never be promulgated as science; but as far as science has proved its premises, it walks amicably in step with the Bible.

Here it will be relevant to quote from Lord Bacon's *Novum Organum:* "Anyone who properly considers the subject will find natural philosophy to be, after the Word of God, the surest remedy against superstition and the most approved support of faith. She is therefore rightly bestowed upon religion as a most faithful attendant, for the one exhibits the *will* and the other the *power* of God. Nor was He wrong who observed, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures and the power of God,' thus uniting in one bond the revelation of His will and contemplation of His power."

(4) *Scientific theories change.*

Perhaps it will not be amiss to add that scientific opinions often change. For instance, in former days the nebular hypothesis, first advanced by Laplace, was all the vogue in the scientific world, and was then believed to be in perfect accord with the Genesiacal

---

[1] Cf. Drummond: *Natural Law in the Spiritual World.* Chapter on Biogenesis; Nevison Loraine: *The Battle of Belief,* pp. 148-154; *The Evolution of the Earth and its Inhabitants* (pp. 91, 93, 94, 107), by five Yale University professors. The page references are to Professor Woodruff's chapter on *The Origin of Life,* in which he discusses seven different theories none of which solve the problem.

[2] Cf. Fairhurst: *Theistic Evolution,* pp. 59-83. The author quotes from many leading scientists on these topics.

account of the creation and development of the universe (Gen. 1:1-3). But now it is questioned by many scientists who are advocating the so-called planetesimal theory.[3]

But the point is, since scientific men are constantly shifting from one viewpoint to another, no one needs to be in a hurry to give up the Biblical account of things because it does not always harmonize with scientific conjecture. The eminent geologist, Charles Lyell, once said: "The French Institute enumerated no less than eighty geological theories which were hostile to the Scriptures; but not one of these theories is held today."[4] In Germany, where Darwinism once was popular among scientists, it has now been practically abandoned.[5] May not Christians, therefore, possess their souls in patience?

10. Proofs from the Biblical World-View.

(1) *Definition of world-view.*

By world-view is meant a view that will adequately explain all the diversified phenomena of the cosmos. That world-view (in other words, that philosophy) which is the most rational and uplifting is the one that should be accepted.[6] Let us note the world-view (German, *Weltanschauung and Weltansicht*) set forth in the Bible, and see how comprehensive and engaging it is.

---

[3] Cf. *The Evolution of the Earth and Its Inhabitants*, p. 11. Professor Barrell says that "now not much remains of the original conception of Laplace."

[4] See J. W. Porter: *Evolution—A Menace*, p. 47.

[5] Cf. Dennert: *At the Deathbed of Darwinism* (English translation).

[6] Cf. Orr: *The Christian View of God and the World.*

(2) *The Biblical doctrine of God.*

The Bible teaches that there is a God—one who is personal, all-wise, all-powerful, righteous and beneficent and that He created and governs the universe. Is that not an appealing view? Ought not everybody to rejoice in that fact? Does anyone prefer to live in a universe that has not been created and is not ruled by an intelligent and all-powerful personal Being? Think of being satisfied to live in a world which has no competent pilot at the wheel, but that is going along—oh, well, somehow or other, no one knows how!

But suppose for the sake of the argument that there is such a God as the Bible depicts—what great things follow logically? Then He is wise and powerful enough to uphold the universe; then He must have made it for a good and wise purpose; then He can and will guide it to its noblest destiny; then He cares for His rational creatures, saves them from sin and misery (if they are willing), and brings them to immortal bliss and glory in fellowship with Himself; then, too, this wonderful universe, when all evil has been elided from it, will be the eternal habitation of the intelligent moral beings He has created; for the Bible says: "There shall be new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. 3:13).

There you have the Biblical world-view in the large. Is it not attractive? A pessimist once said when this view was presented to him, "It is too beautiful to be true!" Our reply is, It is too beautiful *not* to be true! If the world is a rational world, it must be true.

(3) *The ethical and spiritual viewpoint.*

From an ethical and spiritual viewpoint the Biblical system is far superior to any other conception. It teaches that man is a free being, capable of choice and of moral character; it represents man as having a spiritual faculty with which to hold communion with the ultimate Reality, the personal God who created all finite realities. This view of man agrees with the science of psychology, which recognizes—at least, it should recognize—that man has not only intellectual faculties, but also ethical and spiritual faculties, and that the latter are just as outstanding and integral a part of his psychical constitution as are any other functioning powers that he possesses.

(4) *The Biblical Philosophy.*

The Christian system also teaches the best philosophy, not in an abstruse and technical fashion, overburdened with difficult abstract terms, but in a clear, straightforward way that is easily grasped. The great problem of philosophy is to find the *ultimate unifying principle of the cosmos*, which, as all men can see, is made up of a marvelous diversity of parts. What is the only adequate unifying principle and power in so vast a universe with such endless variety? It is evidently *personality*. An all-wise, omnipotent Personality is the only power that can hold all things in a harmonious whole. An *ego* is the only true and ultimate solidarity. So it is with human *I-hood*. So with God. He is the absolute *I;* One and Only; the great Open Secret; the only One who can solve for us "the riddle of the universe."

Therefore, we conclude that the Bible exhibits the only adequate and satisfying world-view.[7] This discussion leads us logically to the next major division of our system of Apologetics.

---

[7] For an extended vindication of the Biblical World-view, the reader is referred to the Author's book entitled *The Philosophy of Christianity*.

Part III

CHRISTIAN THEISM AND OPPOSING THEORIES

CHAPTER XVI

I. REASONS FOR THIS THESIS.

We have just seen that the Biblical (or Christian) world-view is an attractive and rational one. It implies the existence of God as the Creator, Preserver and Redeemer of the world. Some people may think that a discussion of the existence of God does not belong specifically to the discipline of Christian Apologetics, but should be left for the science of Natural Theism. However, in these days when many counter-views are promulgated, all of which, if accepted, would involve the rejection of Christianity, we believe that thoroughness requires the presentment of the theistic proofs and the refutation of the opposing arguments.

In the old days of Deism it was not necessary to present the proofs of the divine existence, for then it

was seldom questioned; it was only necessary to vindicate the character of the God of the Bible; but today atheism and materialism stalk abroad, and, therefore, an adequate treatment of the Evidences of Christianity must deal with these undermining conceptions.

II. CHRISTIAN THEISM.

1. Definitions.

(1) *Of Theism.*

Theism is the doctrine of God as a person, transcendent and immanent Being. The word "theism" is from the Greek, *theos*, meaning God.

(2) *Of Natural Theism.*

Natural Theism is the science which treats of the existence and character of God in the light of nature and reason. It is also called Rational Theism and Natural Theology.

(3) *Of Christian Theism.*

Christian Theism is the science which treats of the existence and character of God according to the Bible in correlation with the teaching of nature and reason. Other terms of Christian Theism are Biblical Theism and Revealed Theology.

2. Biblical Proofs of the Divine Existence.

The Bible nowhere attempts to prove the divine existence, but takes it for granted. In two places it says: "The fool (that is, the scoffer) hath said in his

heart, There is no God" (Ps. 14:1; 53:1). This is, no doubt, an example of the fundamental insight of the inspired writers in general, for the person who says *in his heart*, "There is no God," is likely to scoff at everything sacred. But remember that the Bible does not call the *honest* doubter or agnostic by this epithet.

The exalted character ascribed to God in the Bible, surpassing so greatly the conceptions of human philosophies and of the ethnic religions, is one of the strongest proofs of its inspiration. It is difficult to understand how writers living so long ago, even at the beginning of human history, could have gotten such a conception without divine aid, especially when all the nations around them were steeped in idolatry. Why were the Hebrew writers the only ones who had such lofty conceptions? And how does it occur that all of them, from Genesis to Revelation, had the same ideas of God? Why were they alone monotheists? Inspiration and revelation furnish the only adequate explanation.

Such a portrayal of God as is found in the Bible is also the most convincing proof of His existence, for how could such a conception of God have arisen if there is no God? Note, too, the calm assurance of the Biblical writers in speaking of God, just as if from the beginning He had clearly and unmistakably revealed Himself to them. Here we have strong evidence for both the existence of God and the divine inspiration of the Bible.

3. Corroborative Proofs of the Divine Existence.[1]

(1) *The general argument.*

The General Argument is the argument for the divine existence which is based on the universal belief in God and the universal religious instinct.

That all nations and tribes believe in supernatural beings cannot be denied. Scientists themselves have made detailed investigations and report the above statement to be true.

Now, if there is no God, how could the idea of God ever arise in the human mind? Could a God-idea evolve of its own accord out of a no-God ground or basis? Can water rise higher than its source? If there is nothing in existence but material substance, and if material substance has led almost all people to believe in God, then material substance must be a universal falsifier, not to be trusted in any case.

(2) *The cosmological argument.*

This is the argument for the divine existence that is based on the law of causality.

This principle is that every effect and event must have an adequate cause. The world is here; we cannot deny its existence. It is contingent, for it is made up of parts, each of which is dependent on other parts; hence as a whole it must be dependent on something other than itself. Being made up of finite parts, it must

[1] Many works on both Christian and Natural Theism have been written. In the Selected Bibliography a number of them are listed.

be finite as a whole, however immense. Therefore, it cannot be eternal, for that which is eternal must be absolute, infinite and independent of anything outside of itself. Therefore the world must have had a beginning. But it could not have created itself; *ergo,* it must have had a Creator—God.

It is also an orderly world, a cosmos, not a chaos; therefore, it could not have come about by chance. The only adequate cause of an orderly world is an ordering Intelligence—a personal God.

(3) *The teleological argument.*

This is the argument for the divine existence which is based on the evidences of design, purpose and adaptation in the world. It is known as the argument from design; also from final cause.

Note the many proofs of design in the world, and of adaptation of means to ends: the eye for sight (for what else could this organ have been intended?); the ear for hearing (how wonderfully constructed for its specific purpose!); the brain, the heart, the lungs, the digestive apparatus, the foot, the whole human organism, each part functioning specifically and all working together in a common purpose. Can any one believe that all this could have come about by mere fortuity? That would be too great a miracle for even the most credulous to believe. But if God framed man's body as the Bible teaches (Gen. 2:7), all is clear as day.

The many wonderful chemical combinations, all adapted for a useful end, afford proof of intention-

ality. So do vegetable organisms; animal life and instincts; the air for breathing; water for drinking and purifying; vegetables for food; sunshine and rain and bland winds to promote life—all speak in clamant tones of purpose and adaptation. All is evidence of intelligence.

Note man himself with his mentality. Many of his actions are purposive. Can it be that the Power that gave him being is less purposive, less intelligent? Indeed, how could a blind system of nature evolve such a being as man, who in a thousand ways acts with specific ends in view? Can water rise higher than its source? Can you get a greater out of a lesser? Can you get something out of nothing? Can a cosmos arise out of chaos? Design connotes intelligence, and intelligence connotes personality, and that means God.

(4) *The moral argument.*

This argument for God's existence is based upon man's moral nature and the moral order of the world.

Man is a moral being; that cannot be intelligently questioned, for he distinguishes between right and wrong; when he does right, his conscience approves; when he does wrong, his conscience condemns. He is also placed in the midst of an environment that integrates with his moral nature giving him a chance to choose between right and wrong and to develop and discipline moral character. Hence the world is a moral economy correlating with man as a moral agent.

How do these facts prove the existence of God,

especially such a God as the Bible portrays? In this way:

a. The mutual adaptation of the world as a moral arena and of man as a moral agent connotes design, and wise design as well; but we have seen that design connotes intelligence and will, and thus leads to God as the Creator.

b. The moral could not evolve merely by means of resident forces from the non-moral; therefore, the source of the moral regime of the world must be moral; which again leads back to God.

c. Morality can be predicated only of rational personalities; never of mere things or animals; therefore, the Ultimate Ground or Source of morality must be a rational personality; which again leads back to God.

No wonder Immanuel Kant, who could not appreciate the force of the other theistic arguments, was convinced of the divine existence by the moral argument.

The Bible teaches the doctrine that God exists, that He is the source of all good, and hence of moral reality, and that He administers the moral law in a moral universe; therefore, on this most vital issue the Bible and reason agree.

(5) *The esthetic argument.*

This argument is based on the presence of beauty and sublimity in the universe as an evidence of the existence of a personal God.

There are beauty and sublimity in the universe; there is also beauty in the human physique and in the

works of art. Man has an esthetic faculty by which he is able to appreciate and enjoy beauty. How does it occur that the beauty of the world and the esthetic faculty in man correspond so wonderfully? Evidently this agreement came about by design; but, as we have seen, design connotes intelligence, and intelligence means personality—which once again leads back to God.

The Bible teaches that God made all the beauty and sublimity of the universe. He looked upon His handiwork and pronounced it "good" and "very good." The Psalmist breaks out in this rapt language: "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night showeth knowledge" (Ps. 19:1, 2). Christ pointed to the lilies of the field, and declared that "Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these" (Matt. 6:28, 29). Thus we see again that the teaching of the Bible and the conclusions of reason are in beautiful accord.

(6) *The ontological argument.*[2]

This argument for the divine existence is based on the fact that *the human mind has the necessary conception of a perfect and absolute Being.* The word is derived from the Greek (*ontos*, of being and *logos*, word. *Ontology*, the Science of being).

---

[2] Among the great men who have thought deeply on the Ontological Argument and have given it form and force may be mentioned the following: Plato, Anselm, Descartes, Butler, Cousin, Leibnitz, Sir William Hamilton, Dorner, Valentine, Orr and Harris.

This argument is rather profound, and does not appeal with convincing force to some minds. Some thinkers, however, regard it as the most cogent argument, bringing all the others to a climax. We are sure that when properly stated it is convincing.

Man cannot think of the relative without also thinking of the Absolute, for the one connotes the other; nor can he think of the derived without also thinking of the Underived; nor of the dependent without implying the Independent; nor of the imperfect without connoting the Perfect; nor of the finite without inferring the Infinite. Now observe—if the absolute, underived, independent and perfect Being does not exist, then man's necessary conceptions, the most profound and fundamental conceptions of which he is capable, are null and void, and his mind is illogical and ineffective in its very constitution. If that were true, all our thinking would be insane and futile. Can we believe that?

Therefore, if our best thinking is valid, the *absolute and perfect Being must exist.* And of course, such a Being must be personal or He would not be perfect; for rational personality, be it remembered, is the highest and noblest conception of which the human mind is capable.

Let us remember again that the Bible represents God as the only perfect, absolute and independent Being; so that the Bible and reason again coincide.

CHAPTER XVII

III. ANTI-CHRISTIAN THEORIES.

1. Atheism and Materialism.

Atheism is the negative pole, Materialism the positive. Atheism simply denies God's existence and makes no further assertions. Materialism also denies the divine existence and, in addition, asserts positively that material substance is the only substance that exists; it rejects all ideas of spiritual or psychical entities.

If the latter theory is true, the universe must be the outcome of chance, or mere fortuity. Then why is the world a cosmos instead of a chaos? Why is there the reign of law instead of anarchy? How can there be marks of intelligence in the product of blind forces? How could material substance produce mind with the powers of thinking, feeling and willing? How could thought evolve out of non-thinking substance by means of purely "resident forces"? Can something come out of nothing, a greater out of a lesser, a higher out of a lower?

And why do almost all men, instead of believing that they are derived from material substance, be-

lieve in God? Matter surely performs strange exploits, and must be a universal deceiver, to make most men believe in God if there is no God. So materialism fails to account for many things, and especially those that are the most worth while.

Christian Theism, on the other hand, is adequate. It teaches that both matter and mind are real; that both God and the universe exist; and in teaching the doctrine of a personal, all-wise and all-powerful God as Creator, Preserver and Ruler, it assigns an adequate cause for all the varied phenomena in the universe.

2. Idealism.

This theory is the direct opposite of materialism; it holds that matter has no existence; there is no entity but mind.

We hesitate to include this thesis among the anti-Christian theories because we know some philosophical idealists who are professing Christians. We can only say that their philosophy is not consistent with their faith, and, therefore, they are illogical.

Nothing is clearer than that the Bible intends to teach the objective reality of the material cosmos; almost every line from the first to the last seems to take that fact for granted. There is nowhere the faintest hint to indicate that men only *imagine* the reality of matter, or that matter is only a form of thought that God impinges on man's consciousness. If God does that, and leads virtually all men to believe

that the material world is a real entity, then it does seem as if God Himself imposes falsehood upon man's thinking processes, and the deception is almost universal.

To the idealist's contention we reply: (1) Your theory is opposed to the universal human consciousness, and hence is not likely to be true, since we believe that we live in a rational world. (2) Idealism makes the natural world a chimera, a seeming, and that gives to human life an atmosphere of unreality, which is not salutary. (3) It cannot be practiced even by its votaries, who always act as if matter were real; it is not profitable to adopt a philosophy by which men cannot live. (4) It is too abstruse and difficult for practical people, who must always strain their thought even to get a dim conception of its meaning. (5) If our consciousness deceives us in thinking that the world is real (when it is not), may it not also deceive us when we think of God and of right and wrong?

There is danger, then, that this philosophy will lead to universal doubt and destroy the basis of both religion and morality. The plain Christian view, namely, that the world, God, and human minds are real entities, is much the better philosophy.

3. Deism.

Deism teaches that God is a personal Being who created the universe, then forsook it and gave it over to the control of secondary laws and forces which He ordained for that purpose.

It teaches the transcendence of God, but denies His immanence—that is, His presence in the world.

It flourished in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was infidel respecting the Bible, a bitter opponent of Christianity and advocated what is called "The Religion of Nature," holding that man needs no special divine revelation, such as given in the Bible, because the light of nature and reason is sufficient.

Reply: (1) It is inconceivable that a good and wise God would desert the world which He created, and especially His sentient and rational creatures. (2) Men cannot long love and respect a God who leaves them in their sin and suffering, and goes off on a long vacation. (3) As a matter of fact, Deism accomplished nothing positive for the betterment of humanity, and long ago lost its hold on men's minds. (4) It did not succeed in keeping even many of its chief votaries in the path of virtue, because it had a constant tendency to undermine the basis of morality. (5) It finally degenerated into universal skepticism, especially in Hume and Gibbon. Such a mental state brings discontent and pessimism in its train.

4. Pantheism.

This is the philosophy that *identifies* God and the world; the universe is God and God is the universe; God is everything, the "All."

Today there is a tendency among liberalistic theologians toward pantheistic views. So much stress is laid by them on the immanence of God that they almost overlook His transcendence. Some of them even disparage the idea of divine transcendence. It is

not, however, a new theory. Hinduism, which existed centuries before Christ, is a thoroughgoing system of pantheism.

Consider the following arguments against this philosophy: (1) First, it forces matter and mind into one substance, but gives no proof of their unity; such man-handling of two different entities is neither scientific nor rational. (2) It denies personality and intelligence to God; for such expressions as "unconscious intelligence" and "unconscious will" are self-contradiction. (3) It affords very little or no satisfaction to the religious mind, for there can be no true communion between man and a non-personal something. (4) It is vague and indeterminate, and hence unsatisfying to the intellect which craves clear thought. (5) It is inconsistent in its doctrine of divine immanence, because an entity cannot be immanent in itself; it *is* itself. (6) In the form given to pantheism by Spinoza no clear conception can be formed of a fundamental substance which has two such attributes as *thought and extension.* (7) It denies personal immortality for man, who when he dies, simply sinks back into the All, just as a drop of rain falls into the ocean and loses its identity. In Hinduism this is called the doctrine of re-absorption.

How much clearer is the teaching of the Bible about God! It does not confuse God and the universe; it teaches both God's transcendence and immanence; hence it is not one-sided. This is the only rational view, because it is only a transcendent Being who can be personally present everywhere in the realm of space.

5. Positivism.

Positivism is both a philosophy and a religion, although the two are not vitally connected.

As a philosophy it professes to deal only with phenomena; only with things supposed to be *known;* hence the term "Positivism"—things of which we can be positively sure. It scornfully rejects all metaphysics. It is agnostical with regard to the essence of things; that is, with what are called *noumena,* or things in themselves. It will assert nothing about the essence of matter, nor of the soul of man, nor of God. True, these *may* exist, but we do not *know* whether they exist or not; and if they do, we know nothing of their essential nature. We know only *phenomena* (outward appearances).

Yet, inconsistently, this theory seems to be absolutely sure it knows that much; it knows that grass is green, but it knows nothing about the grass itself! But how does it know that grass is green, if it doesn't know whether there *is* any grass or not?

What shall be said of this philosophy? It is different from the phenomenalism of Kant, who taught that our minds are so constituted that they give their *own forms* to phenomena, and, therefore, the *noumena* may be something very different from what men think them to be; just as colored glass would make the objects around us look very different from what they are to the natural vision. Positivism also differs from Idealism in that the latter denies the existence of matter entirely, while the former simply says that we do not know whether matter exists or not.

We reply: It is true, we see only phenomena, not things themselves in their own essence; but we believe that we live in a rational world and that our minds are rationally framed, and that, therefore, the phenomena which we observe do not deceive us, but report the *noumena* truly as far as we are capable of comprehending them. We hold, moreover, that the *noumena* must exist, or there could be no *phenomena.*

Should it be said that this illusion—like others—can be corrected by further investigation, that the facts can be ascertained? Even the mirage is a reality—a real reflection and refraction on the atmosphere given off from a real landscape in the vicinity. Were there no real landscape and no real atmosphere, there would be no mirage. The Christian believer cannot accept the doctrine that all men are afflicted with mental impotency and live in a chimerical world. He is a realist of the first order.

As a religion, Positivism deifies and worships humanity. By humanity it does not mean the whole *genus homo*, but only the best people who have died and whose helpful influence is still with us today. It has a cultus of forms and ceremonies that are largely borrowed from the Roman Catholic Church.

The founder of this system both in philosophy and religion was Auguste Comte, a Frenchman who was born in 1798 and died in 1857. After he had established his philosophy, he noted that man is "incorrigibly religious," and, therefore, he grafted on a

system of religion, which has little organic connection with his philosophy.

What shall be said of this view of religion? In worshiping humanity, it worships an abstraction. The post-mortem influence of the worthy dead is no entity, not a concrete something, not a person; hence this cultus fails to meet the real needs of religion. Christians also believe in the influence of the beloved and worthy dead as the Bible says of righteous Abel: "He being dead, yet speaketh" (Heb. 11:4); also of those who have died in the Lord: "And their works do follow them" (Rev. 14:13).

But Christians are not such idolaters as to worship this hallowed influence; they worship God only although they gladly receive inspiration from the example of the faithful who have departed (Heb. 12:1). Christianity avoids and discredits every human cultus that is puerile and one-sided.

CHAPTER XVIII

III. ANTI-CHRISTIAN THEORIES (*continued*).

6. Naturalistic Evolution.[1]

This is a philosophy, not a science; a system of speculation, not verified knowledge.

Let us define it: Naturalistic evolution is that theory which holds that all things have been brought to their present status by a series of progressive changes according to certain fixed laws, and by means of resident forces.

It denies the existence of God. One of its chief exponents was the late Professor Ernst Haeckel, of Germany, who averred that "God, freedom and immortality" are "the three great buttresses of superstition" which it is the business of science to destroy.

This theory, which is today the most active and dangerous foe of Christianity, is inadequate in many ways: (1) It cannot account for origins: the origin of matter, force, life, plant and animal species, sen-

[1] In the Selected Bibliography will be found lists of helpful books on evolution. In his own library the author has all these books and brochures, and, in addition, as many that are in favor of the theory. This is said in order that readers may know that the author has conscientiously studied both sides of the question.

tience, consciousness, intelligence, conscience and will; nor for the universal belief in God; nor for men's moral and spiritual experience; (2) It is a constant effort to get something out of nothing, to get the greater out of the less, to get something higher and better out of something less and inferior—which is both unscientific and unphilosophical; (3) It assumes that spontaneous generation and the transmutation of species have taken place in the remote past, whereas no such phenomena have ever been observed and verified; (4) Its moral influence cannot help being baleful, for it lays constant emphasis on man's brute origin and "the struggle for existence," which tends to make men more and more debased and selfish.

Surely its moral implications must condemn it in the eyes of Christian people and others who are concerned for the highest welfare of the human family. This theory reached its climax and practical application in Nietzsche's philosophy of "might makes right" and "the will to power."

7. Theistic Evolution.[2]

Naturalistic evolution must be distinguished from what is known as theistic evolution, whose interpreters

---

[2] Among other good works on this subject are Professor Fairhurst: *Theistic Evolution* (1919); Professor Graebner: *Evolution, An Investigation and a Criticism* (1921); Professor G. B. O'Toole: *The Case Against Evolution* (1925), second printing, 1926; G. M. Price: *The Phantom of Organic Evolution* (1924); same author: *Evolutionary Geology and the New Catastrophism* (1926); H. C. Morton: *The Bankruptcy of Evolution* (1924); C. B. McMullen: *The Logic of Evolution* (1925). See other important works in the Selected Bibliography.

believe in God and teach that evolution is His method of working—His *modus operandi.* Many professedly Christian scholars are advocates of this view, and seem to think that those who do not accept it are sadly behind the times.

The author of this work believes that these exponents do not use the term "evolution" accurately; they give it a meaning that is too elastic. Some of them even include creation and miracle in the evolutionary process. That surely is unscientific; it forces a meaning into the word that its originators never intended. Evolution is progress by slow degrees or by mutations (De Vries), "by means of resident forces" (Le Conte). Therefore, creation and miracle cannot properly be called evolution, for they imply something brought into being *ex nihilo* and the addition of something new from without.

The term "evolution" is often used to designate any kind of progress, and in this sense many good people think it has come to stay. When it is used in this elastic sense, however, everybody should understand that it is not employed in the original *scientific* sense.[3]

The author desires to add here that he has no disposition to cast any reflections on the sincerity and intelligence of those who advocate theistic evolution. They constantly pour scorn and ridicule on men who cannot accept their views, and accuse them of "ignorance of science," of dishonesty, of lack of a pro-

---

[3] See the Author: *Contending for the Faith,* Chapter XIV, and *The Problem of Origins,* pp. 13-18, 73-75, 84, 85.

gressive spirit, and of general incompetency. We make no counter accusations. We have tried to keep our discussion on a dispassionate basis, and to avoid epithets that would cloud the scientific and theological issues involved.

Now, according to the Bible, God uses at least three processes: first, *creation* by which a new entity is brought into existence; second, *miracle* by which He introduces a new force to bring in new conditions, such as are not possible through natural law; third, the *process of gradual development* by means of secondary laws and forces.

In addition to natural processes, the Bible teaches plainly that creation and miracles were necessary for the origin and preservation of the world. To describe the whole method, therefore, we would suggest the use of the three terms: creation, miracle and development. We prefer the word "development" to the word "evolution," because the latter has come to mean almost anything and everything, and, therefore, means nothing definite. A word that has no stabilized meaning is certainly not a good scientific term.

We shall frankly state some serious objections to the view that is known as theistic evolution:

(1) *No proof of spontaneous generation.*

No empirical proofs have yet been furnished by science that spontaneous generation has ever been God's method of bringing living matter out of dead matter. Many evolutionists themselves—and those of the highest repute—admit that the law of biogenesis

now holds the field.[4] Life could not be evolved from non-life.

(2) *No proof of transmutation of species.*

Science has not yet demonstrated the transmutation of species; theology therefore, cannot safely say that it is God's method. It is not proved by geology or biology, nor by the experiments of Darwin, Mendel and Burbank. Dr. William Bateson (December, 1921) admitted that science cannot explain the origin of species, and that the theory of evolution must be accepted "by faith." Then why shall anyone be in a great hurry to cast away the Biblical explanation of special creations?

(3) *Not taught in the Bible.*

If evolution is God's method of working, it ought to be plainly taught in the Bible. But the world went on for centuries, and no Biblical writer even mentioned it. The doctrine of creation is clearly taught in Holy Writ, also the fact of miracles at crucial epochs in the world's history. Why was not evolution taught if it is the divine method?

(4) *Not in evidence today.*

If evolution is God's method, it ought to be in evidence everywhere today. It ought to show its hand. To ask for eons of time is merely to beg the question and admit that there is no present proof of the theory.

---

[4] Among them are Vernon Kellogg, J. Arthur Thomson, E. B. Wilson, Lorando L. Woodruff. Kellogg quotes approvingly the proverb: *Omne vivum ex vivo.* See his: *Evolution: The Way of Man*, pp. 110, 111.

What law do we see dominant today? The law of the fixity of type. It is writ large on the face of things everywhere. Any child can see it. But if evolution is the dominant law, why does it not show its hand clearly? Besides, is not the law of stability of type the right one, the beneficent one? If all things were in a state of flux or plasticity, man could not depend on nature because plants and animals would not hold true to type. A state of flux in the organic realm would mean a welter.

(5) *The theory leads to infidelity.*

Loath as we are to say it, the theory of evolution has gone hand in hand with infidelity, rationalism, negative Biblical criticism and materialism. In modern times philosophic evolution perhaps began with Hegel, with his theory of "becoming" and his idea of thesis, analysis and synthesis. He was anything but a Christian philosopher. His philosophy was adopted by the destructive New Testament critics, Baur and Strauss. Graf, Wellhausen and Kuenen accepted evolution, and based their negative criticism of the Old Testament upon it. Darwin, Huxley and Spencer, the founders of so-called scientific evolution, were agnostics. Haeckel, the arch-materialist of Germany, and Leuba, the arch-advocate of atheism in America, were and are evolutionists. The Rationalists of England—a purely infidel association—professedly base their views on Darwinism.

A Christian man should, therefore, be cautious about putting himself into such company by adopting their

shibboleth, which is evolution. A recent book *The Evolution of the Earth and Its Inhabitants*, does not contain the word God;[5] neither does the popularly written handbook, *The A B C of Evolution* (1921), by Joseph McCabe. Everything is put on a purely naturalistic basis. The second work particularly aims to account for everything in the universe in this way. We quote a paragraph from what the author says about "The Origin of Man" (pp. 107, 108):

"We came of a remote animal ancestor. What was it like, and how and why did it become man? I have said that it is now customary to explain very carefully that our ancestor was *not* a monkey or an ape. I confess that I think this caution overdone. It is a concession to the spiritual police. If we had the remains of man's ancestors before us, they would almost certainly be classed as those of monkeys in the earlier stage and as apes in the later. Possibly some of them are actually among the existing fossils."

The book is written in a popular style for the purpose of making the theory of evolution plain and simple for laymen and young people. And the theory is taught everywhere with a cocksureness that says, "It's all settled! No need of further argument!" We

---

[5] The word "Creator" *does* occur once in this book (p. 108), and strangely enough, in a quotation from Darwin's early work (1859), *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. This was before Darwin's theorizing had led him into agnosticism, and, therefore, is a rather belated citation. Otherwise we have not been able to find the slightest reference to God or anything supernatural in the book named in the text. Yet it tries to account for the origin of the world and all it contains, including man!

have studied many works on dogmatic theology of ancient, medieval and modern times; but we must confess that this work on evolution out-dogmatizes all of them. The author's contemptuous reference to "the spiritual police" indicates his attitude towards Christianity. It is his only reference to anything spiritual.[6]

(6) *It tends to loose views of the Bible.*

Again, candor compels us to say that, when a man accepts evolution, even though he prefixes it with the word "theistic," he almost always sits loosely on the doctrine of the Bible. Many instances might be cited. Rev. E. Griffith Jones and Canon Barnes both declared in favor of evolution, and straightway began to treat the Old Testament account of the creation as myth, legend and folklore. Canon Barnes averred that, because he had accepted the theory of evolution, he could no longer believe the Biblical account of the creation, nor of the fall of man, nor Paul's doctrine that in Adam all died.

A number of liberalistic ministers in Columbus, Ohio, scoffed at the narrative of the garden of Eden as a "fairy tale," at the virgin birth of Christ, and the vicarious atonement wrought by Him; at the same time

---

[6] Since the above was written, a book entitled, *The Revelation of God in Nature*, comprising a debate between Rev. C. G. Shebbeare and Joseph McCabe, has appeared, and we have read it carefully. Mr. McCabe is widely known as one of the foremost rationalists of the world. In this work he takes the position that God is only an idea, not a personality. In a still more recently published brochure on evolution he makes it plain that he is an infidel regarding the Bible and at least an agnostic respecting the existence of God. Such seems to be the sad tendency with many of the advocates of evolution.

they boldly proclaimed their acceptance of evolution instead of these Biblical doctrines. These data ought to give earnest people pause.

8. Monism.

This is the philosophy that reduces everything to *one substance*. Hence it will not tolerate the dualism of mind and matter and of God and the universe.

The term Monism is introduced here only to give the student a proper conception of its meaning. There are several forms of Monism, all of which have already received treatment in previous sections of this work. Spinoza's philosophy of pantheism is monistic, because it reduces everything to one substance with its two attributes of thought and extension. Idealism is monistic, denying the reality of matter and asserting the reality of mind only. Materialism is also monistic, holding that the only substance is matter, so that the idea of mind and God as separate entities is mere delusion.

Opposed to all monistic conceptions is the Christian view of dualism when properly defined, namely, that God and the universe are separate entities; not, however, that the universe is eternal, but that it was created *ex nihilo* by the Almighty. Stated concisely and courageously, the Christian view is this: Before the creation there was Monism, God being the only existence; after creation there was Dualism; the universe, though made by Him, was something different from Him as to essence. This profound view makes God the Sovereign of the Universe, transcendent to it,

yet immanent in it. What confidence this view implants in the believing soul, for it means that God will not permit His plans for the high destiny of man and the universe to miscarry.

9. Agnosticism.

This theory declares that we do not and cannot know whether there is a God or not.

A few words in refutation: (1) The proofs thus far advanced in this section offer satisfying evidence of the divine existence; (2) The agnostic surely does not know enough about the universe to deny the possibility of knowing that there is a God: that is almost an assumption of omniscience; (3) Untrue to their name, agnostics assume to know a great deal about the "Inscrutable Power" that controls the universe. If they know so much about it, how can it be "inscrutable"? Said someone to Herbert Spencer, the arch-agnostic: "You know too much about your unknowable God." Dr. James H. Snowden puts it acutely: "Such denial of knowledge must deny its own denial, and thereby cancel itself. Agnosticism literally commits suicide, and then strangely keeps on talking." [7]

[7] *The Personality of God*, p. 57. Snowden's whole discussion of this theme is acute. Although we cite Dr. Snowden's book approvingly here and name it in our Bibliography, we wish it to be understood that we do not endorse his modernistic attitude toward the Bible, but are positively opposed to it. We regard his book, *Old Faith and New Knowledge*, as a very radical book, especially for a professor in a Presbyterian theological seminary. However, it must be said that the book cited in the text is singularly persuasive and convincing on the personality of God and the theistic world-view.

Altogether satisfying is the Christian view: We know there is a God. Although we do not know all about Him, we know enough for all practical purposes. He comes to us through His Word and Spirit, and gives us a real sense of His blessed and comforting presence; He assures us of pardon and salvation; He promises that sometime we shall see Him face to face and know Him as He is.

10. The Doctrine of a Finite God.

This hypothesis holds that God, though great and powerful, is finite in power and wisdom.[8] It is a view advocated by Hume, J. S. Mill, William James, and H. G. Wells. They think it helps best to explain the presence of evil in the world: God, being finite, could not prevent it. This view, they imagine, exonerates Him from blame. And *we* are placed here in the world to *aid* Him in overcoming evil, though the advocates of the theory give no assurance that our combined efforts will bring success.

Note the refutation: (1) A finite God would sometime become exhausted in upholding so vast a universe as ours, and, therefore, it would drop into catastrophic ruin; (2) He might also blunder so often as to wreck the universe; (3) If He could not prevent

---

[8] This theory is effectively dealt with in Pringle-Pattison: *The Idea of God in the Light of Recent Philosophy* (1917), pp. 324, 401, 405; Henry C. Sheldon: *Pantheistic Dilemmas and Other Essays in Philosophy and Religion* (1920), pp. 55, 56, 103, 104, 107-117; James H. Snowden: *The Personality of God.* We take pleasure in citing these works by Pringle-Pattison, Sheldon and Snowden, but we do not agree with their liberalistic views of Christianity and the Bible.

evil, He never can overcome it; (4) Even with man's help He could not overcome evil, for, since He created man, man could add nothing to His power; (5) As all men are sinful, and as a vast number of them are either opposed to Him or indifferent to Him, they are much more of a hindrance to Him than an aid in His contest with evil. Thus we see that it is a weak and hopeless doctrine.

The Christian teaching alone can satisfy, viz., that God is infinite in His essence and in all His attributes; therefore, He could create and can forever uphold the universe; He permitted evil, because He saw it was better to have a moral universe than a mere machine filled with automata; but since He permitted evil, for reasons well known to Himself, He will be able in His own good time to overcome it; then, as the Bible teaches, there shall be "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." This view certainly puts fibre and hope into the human soul. "Forever, O Lord, Thy Word is settled in heaven" (Ps. 119:89); "Howbeit, the foundation of God standeth sure" (2 Tim. 2:19).

11. Pluralism.

(1) *Definition.*

Pluralism is the view that the cosmos is not a real universe, held together by some unifying force or principle, but is made up of disparate parts and essences.[9]

---

[9] Cf. Pringle-Pattison, *ut supra,* pp. 183, 184, 315-321, 393-398; Snowden, *ut supra,* pp. 90-92. In favor of Pluralism is William James: *A Pluralistic Universe and Pragmatism.* The word "universe" means *turned into one* (*unus, one,* and *verto,* to turn); then how can a universe be pluralistic?

(2) *Its advocates.*

William James and H. G. Wells, who also have advanced the doctrine of a finite God examined in the previous section, are its exponents. The two doctrines seem to have some logical connection.

(3) *Its basis.*

There are some eighty or ninety primary elements in the composition of the material world, and science fails to reduce them to one element; further investigation, indeed, seems to increase the number of primary elements. Oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, etc., remain intact, in spite of all laboratory attempts to separate and convert them into one ultimate atom or electron.

(4) *Its error as a philosophy.*

Although there are various irreducible elements in material substance and it is true that the two entities of matter and mind cannot be merged into one substance, yet there must be some unifying principle or power holding all things in one system, or the universe would be a chaos instead of a cosmos. What is it that holds all these diversified parts and elements and forces in one integral system? The only adequate explanation is the personality of the absolute and omnipotent God. To think of it deeply, an *ego* is the only ultimate unity we know anything about; all else is variety and difference. Why search in some obscure realm for a cause, when one lies plainly before our eyes?

12. Pessimism.

(1) *Definition.*

Pessimism is the doctrine that the world is a misfortune or a lapse, and, therefore, an economy of evil and sorrow.

(2) *Specimen expressions of Pessimists.*

Said Schopenhauer: "This is the worst possible world." Hear him again: "Well for those who have no conscious existence. The life of the animal is more to be envied than that of man; the life of the plant is better than that of the fish in the water, or even of the oyster on the rock. Non-being is better than being, and unconsciousness is the blessedness of what does exist. The best would be if all existence were annihilated." Caro made this plaint: "The height of misery is not that of being man; it is, being man, to despise oneself sufficiently to regret that one is not an animal." Another from von Hartmann: "If this is not the worst world, it is at least worse than none."

Professor Clifford, who fell into skepticism and atheism, grew pessimistic, and made this confession: "We have seen the sun shine out of an empty heaven to light up a soulless earth; we have felt the utter loneliness that the Great Companion is dead." Many similar plaints might be given. Centuries before Christ, Buddha wailed in the same despairing strains, and hence worked out his conception of Nirvana.

(3) *Errors of Pessimism.*

a. It exaggerates the evil and overlooks or minimizes the good in the world.

b. It cares only for temporal and sensuous good, for the merely pleasurable, and fails to appreciate moral, spiritual and eternal values. It is blind to the moral use of discipline and serious tasks.

c. It becomes daunted in the presence of difficulties instead of bravely trying to surmount them and finding exhilaration in the effort. The pessimist sits down and wails because weeds grow in his garden; whereas he should bestir himself, hoe up the weeds, cultivate and fertilize the soil, plant good seed, and raise a crop.

d. It spells the eclipse of faith, hope and love—that splendid triumvirate of Christian virtues.

e. It is another name of moral *anemia.* It is given up to complaint; it grows more and more cynical; it abandons itself to *ennui,* and becomes *blasé.*

f. Many times, if not always, this is the process: A young man becomes skeptical; for a time he feels great freedom, boasts about being "unfettered from superstition," and scoffs at the "ignorance" of Christian believers. By and by he discovers that, after all, he cannot solve life's deep problems; then he falls into agnosticism; having lost faith in God, he can see no kind, wise and beneficent rule in the world; then he grows embittered, sees more evil than good about him,

has no hope for the future, cries cynically, "*Cui bono?*" and falls into blank pessimism.[10]

(4) *The Contrast of Christian Optimism.*

a. It is not so blind as to fail to recognize the evils of the world and to regard them as evil. It never calls good evil and evil good.

b. Christianity, however, also sees and cherishes the good in the world, and believes that it predominates, and is stronger than the evil.

c. Instead of spending valuable time in bemoaning the evil and wondering why it has been permitted, it seeks to mitigate and reduce it and make the good triumphant.

d. It sees in the world just as it is an arena for heroic conflict; a school for the discipline of all the sterling and heroic virtues.

e. It trusts in God and the good, and is sure of ultimate victory. It is sustained by faith, hope and love, and trusts in the divine promises of immortal release and victory (John 14:1-3; Rom. 8:28; 2 Cor. 4:17; 1 Pet. 1:3-9).

---

[10] On pessimism consult the following cogent works: Sheldon: *Unbelief in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 134-149; Orr: *The Christian View of God and the World*, pp. 52-56, 66-72, 169-170, 186, 321, 400-402, 467.

Part IV

THE DOUBTER AND HIS DIFFICULTIES

CHAPTER XIX

I. HIS DISPOSITION OF MIND.

1. He Should be Sincere.

This frame of mind is necessary for ascertaining truth in all realms of knowledge and experience. While one should not be credulous, one should always be receptive and teachable.

2. He Should Never Resort to Ridicule.

Derision indicates a lack of real seriousness. Religious belief is too sacred and important for ridicule. If it is worth anything, it is worth everything.

3. He Should Banish Pride of Opinion.

If he has been proved to be in error, he should be humble and frank enough to confess it. That is the proof, *prima facie*, of a desire for the truth and only the truth. The like may be said of others, whatever their views.

4. He Should not Think Christians Ignorant.

Sometimes unbelievers assume a superior air and seem to think that they are the only persons who *think*. That is a mistake. Most of the difficulties heralded by skeptics have been known and dealt with again and again by Christian scholars. The extensive list of scholarly works in our Selected Bibliography is ample proof of this fact.

5. No Mark of Smartness to Doubt.

It is easy to doubt; most thinking people have their doubts. Many who are ardent Christians today have passed through periods of severe mental and spiritual travail.

6. Doubt not a Good Thing.

In this world of sin and deception one cannot always trust. Sometimes it is one's duty to doubt, or at least withhold his confidence. But does not that very fact connote an abnormal condition of affairs? If the world were a perfect world, and all people were upright and trustworthy, there would be perfect confidence everywhere. Mutual trust, therefore, connotes the normal condition, which proves that, not doubt, but faith is good *per se*. That home is happy where mutual confidence prevails; that home is most miserable where suspicion and distrust have crept in between husband and wife or parents and children. So reasoning by analogy, we would conclude that faith in God who rules the world would be the normal status, while lack of such faith would be abnormal.

II. THE DOUBTER'S DIFFICULTIES.

1. General Remarks.

The doubter may have real difficulties which he has not been able to command the time to resolve. Many excellent and scholarly treatises have been written in explanation of his enigmas, if he would only take the pains to read and examine them with a mind open to reaction.

A few words here in regard to Biblical Difficulties as a whole may be apposite![1] As Tregelles so well said, "A difficulty connected with a proved fact cannot invalidate the fact itself." Applying the statement to the case in hand, if we are once convinced on adequate evidence that the Bible is the Word of God, every specific difficulty should be judged in the light of this antecedent conviction. That would mean that the difficulty is not likely to be of such a character as to contradict the fact that the Bible is God's Word.

We might illustrate. There are difficulties connected with all the facts of nature. For example, it is very difficult to understand how the earth, an immense and seemingly illy balanced globe, can revolve on its invisible axis at the rate of over 1,000 miles an hour at the equator (on the surface), and yet there is not a jar in its movement; so smoothly does it revolve that

---

[1] The material of this and the following paragraph is taken from a letter of the late W. H. Griffith, Jr., the author.

nobody is ever aware of the movement by the evidence of any of his senses. Well may we ask, "How can such a thing be?" Yet it must be a fact. In the field of natural science there are many real difficulties. We know the facts, but cannot explain all the objections. It seems impossible that electricity, an invisible element of some kind, so subtle as to evade all sight, should reveal such marvelous energy. Yet we know it does.

This reasoning may be applied to the Bible. If we are convinced by experience and other proofs that it is God's Word, we will look at the difficulties in an entirely different light from what we would if we were uncertain about its inspiration or hostile to its teaching. Then we will patiently try to solve the difficulties and will welcome every fact that will throw light upon them.

This does not mean that we shall close our eyes to the difficulties, but only that we should be open to a favorable and reasonable explanation of them, if it can be found. It might be antecedently admitted that a Book which has been the instrument of rescuing so many people from a sinful life to an upright and happy one is not likely to be filled with absurdities or unresolvable difficulties. In the light of these principles, let us frankly examine some difficulties that have troubled the doubter.

2. The Narrative of Creation in Genesis.

The cosmogony given in Genesis has been a favorite object of attack on the part of infidels. Many of them laugh at it as childish and unscientific. Perhaps

every word has been examined to see whether there is not some point at which this narrative can be put out of accord with the speculations of science. The persistency with which infidels attack the Biblical account, and the bitterness which they sometimes display, would almost indicate that they do not *want* to believe in a God who created the universe, who made man in His own image, placed him in the midst of a favorable environment, and cared for him both before and after his disobedience. We have often wondered why unbelievers do not prefer to regard the Biblical record as true rather than false.

Observe the scientific character of the first chapter of Genesis. The first verse described the creation of the primordial material: "In the beginning God created[2] the heavens and the earth." Science never describes the origin of matter and force, but simply begins with them, or takes them for granted. The Bible goes back further, but in doing so it does not contradict science. In some way the original material must have come into existence. What could be more reasonable than that God, all-wise and all-powerful created it and stamped upon its very constitution order, law and rationality?

It is worthy of note that the writer of Genesis 1:1

---

[2] The Hebrew word for "create" is *barah*. This word in the Holy Scripture almost always means one of two things—either to produce something *ex nihilo* (out of nothing) or to introduce some new element or power. Here it must have the first meaning, since the heavens and the earth could have had no prior existence. Cf. A. H. Finn: *The Creation, the Fall and the Deluge* (1924), a book of genuine merit and much learning.

mentions "the heavens" first, then "the earth." In his day the geocentric or Ptolemaic theory of the universe prevailed all around him. How did he know what we know today so well, that the earth is small compared with the rest of the universe? What led him to put "the heavens" first? The writer—undoubtedly Moses—anticipated Copernicus and Galileo, and at least gave us a hint of the heliocentric view, or perhaps the view of some great central orb which is the throne of Sovereign Power.

The second verse describes the original nebulous condition of the material thus created: "And the earth was unformed and empty (Hebrew, *tohu vabohu*); and darkness was upon the face of the deep" (the Hebrew for "deep" means the agitated waves). This certainly agrees with what many scientists believe to have been the condition of the primitive material in its dark, unformed and nebulous condition.

Verse three says: "And the Spirit of God (Heb., *Ruach Elohim*) brooded over the face of the waters" (nebulæ). If the original nebula was in a state of equilibrium, as many scientists believe, it could never have generated motion by resident forces. God, being a psychical being, with a will or self-determining power, is the only kind of an entity that could have *initiated* motion. Might not this initial movement account for the stirring of the "ether of space" into vortices or vortex rings, forming electrons, atoms and molecules, thereby constituting all palpable matter, and setting the whole body in circular motion for the division of the mass into the various orbs of the universe?

Motion would generate heat and light; therefore, the third verse says: "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light." Most scientists today hold that the first light of the earth was cosmical, not solar.

Verses 6 to 8 indicate the forming of an expanse (this is the true meaning of the Hebrew word *rakia*) or atmosphere, that separates the clouds and vapors above from the waters below, leaving the intervening space clear for the home and arena of all living creatures, including man. Does not this prove design? It agrees indeed with the teaching of many of the best scientists.

Verses 9-11 indicate what must have taken place sometime in the world's geological history, namely, the separation of the land and the sea. A recent book on science, *The Evolution of the Earth and its Inhabitants*, teaches this fact very clearly.

Verses 11-13 agree with science that the first forms of organic life were vegetables. Note the next verses, 14-19: after the clouds and vapors had been sufficiently dispelled to clarify the atmosphere, the heavenly bodies, the sun, moon and stars, appeared—another point of harmony between the Bible and good scientific authority.

According to verses 20-23, the lower forms of animal life first appeared; then (verses 24-27) came the higher forms, and last of all man came upon the scene to bring the creative era to a climax. Is not this the precise order described by the modern sciences of astronomy, geology, paleontology and biology? Is not

the agreement remarkable? How can we account for it? Compare the cosmogonies of other nations with the rational and scientific account of Genesis.[3]

It may be said that the Genesis record does not harmonize with the theory of evolution, now so much in vogue among scientists and would-be scientists. If by evolution is meant simply progress, however it *is* effected, then we hold that the Bible *does* teach progress, as we have just seen—progress from the primordial material, unformed and void of inhabitants, up through the lower forms of matter and life to the apex, man. And that much, we believe, science has established on empirical principles.

If by evolution, however, is meant unfolding merely by means of resident forces from amœba to man, then we must protest that no scientist has yet proved the theory. As far as science has verified its data, the Bible is in agreement; but when scientists enter the field of speculation and spin out unproved hypotheses, we can not expect God's Book to agree with them.

3. The Creation of Man and Woman.

The Biblical account has met with much scorn on the part of infidel scientists. They seem to think it much nobler and much more rational to believe that man grew up from protoplasm, ooze, mollusks, reptiles and apes (or from the same stock as the apes and monkeys), than that God created him in His own im-

---

[3] See an effective discussion of Genesis I in A. H. Finn's recent work (1924), *The Creation, Fall and Deluge* (pp. 9-28). Cf. also the present author's work (1926): *The Problem of Origins*, especially Chapters II-VII.

age by a direct act; much more inspiring to believe that man was born in a jungle than placed in a garden; much finer to hold that he was developed as a brute than created as a rational, intelligent and ethical being, able to choose between right and wrong and to hold personal communion with his Maker.

Whatever may be said about the matter, it surely is uplifting and reasonable to believe that an all-wise God would make man and woman in the way the Bible describes. If He did, then we can understand why God would care for His rational creatures, would come to their help when they fell into sin and misery, and would provide for them an endless destiny of happiness in fellowship with Himself. Accept the first, second, and third chapters of Genesis, and the whole Christian system becomes intelligible, consistent and rarely attractive.

So much in general. We hold that the Bible account of the origin of man and woman is rational and scientific. First, God *formed*[4] man's body out of the dust (*aphar*, the finest material, according to Keil) of the ground. This is scientific, for man's body, as we know it today, is composed of precisely the same chemical elements as the soil. "Dust thou art, to dust returnest."

Then God breathed into the body of man the breath of life, and he became a living soul. This verse

---

[4] The Hebrew verb here is not *barah*, to create, but *yatsar*, to form, fashion, mold. In Genesis 1:26 ("Let us *make* man," etc.) the verb is *asah*, which means to make, not to grow, unfold or evolve. In Genesis 1:27 the verb is *barah*, which means to create: "And God *created* (barah) man in His own image."

agrees with verse 27 of the first chapter, in which it is said that God *created* man in His own image. In the act of inbreathing, God *created* (*barah*) man's *psyche*, or psychical nature. God is Mind; man, as to his higher nature, is also mind; man was thus made a finite replica of his infinite Creator.[5] See how marvelous this is: God is self-conscious, can say "I"; man also. God knows, feels and wills; man also. Could any conception be more uplifting?

That man was created in the divine image is proved times without number by empirical observation and is, therefore, scientifically established. Were he not made in God's image—that is, not like God in some fundamental respects—he could hold no communion with God. But he can and does have such communion. Therefore, the above conclusion.

Woman was made from the seminal substance of man, and in this way the solidarity of the human family was preserved and established and at the same time the differentiation of the sex was achieved. Had she been made otherwise, the human genus would have had a dual origin. The best science today advocates the unity of the human race. Woman was also made in the divine image, as is taught in Genesis 1:27: "And

---

[5] Observe how accurate the Biblical writer is in his use of words. When he says (Genesis 1:27) that God made man in His own image, referring to man's psychical nature, he uses the verb *barah* (create); when he describes the making of man's body (Genesis 2:7), he used the verb *yatsar*, which means to frame, fashion or mold. The first word signifies to bring something new into existence; the second to fashion into another form something that already exists.

God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him; *male* and *female* created He them." At the very beginning, therefore, the Bible stamps upon woman the same nobility as upon man, and gives her an equal place by his side.[6]

4. Man's Fall Into Sin.

This part of Scripture (Gen. 3:1-22) has also been the object of much ridicule. At the start it should be said that the Bible is not responsible for the presence of sin and suffering in the world; they are here in evidence on every hand. If the Bible had never been written, we would still have this profound and perplexing problem to deal with. The Bible simply tries to tell us how sin came into the world, and then how the world may be saved from its defilement and penal consequences. Cast the Bible away, and the problem of sin will still be with us, more troublesome and insoluble than ever.

But what is the rationale of the Biblical account of the origin of sin? It is this:

God created man a *free being*. If He had not made him a moral agent, capable of choice, man would have been a mere automaton, a machine, an animal and not the divine image. If man was a free moral agent, he had to have the ability and the opportunity to choose. There can be no freedom without a test of freedom. The "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" afforded that necessary ordeal to establish man's moral character.

---

[6] For a critical and more extended discussion of the creation of man and woman, see the author: *The Problem of Origins*, Chapters V and VII.

Remember, there was nothing wrong with man originally; his freedom was not a defect, but his highest enduement; for moral excellence is the highest kind of excellence. The skeptic's objection to this regimen proves that he can think only of *pleasure* as the highest good; that is hedonism, not a sturdy and exalted ethic. It was better, infinitely better, to make man a moral being than a mere automaton. A moral economy is the highest possible conception.

In some places today the doctrine is held that sin is merely the remains of man's *primitive animalism,* inherited from his brute ancestry. His fall (if he ever did fall) consisted in his yielding to his bestial impulses instead of choosing the higher way. This theory is untenable for many reasons, among which we mention these:

(1) It would make God the author of sin, for He must have given to man His animal nature.

(2) The long process of animal development in man, if he was thus evolved, would have proved too strong for him to overcome in the first feeble glimmerings of his moral and spiritual nature; thus man would not have had a fair chance; he would have been foredoomed to fall.

(3) Animals are *not sinful;* they act out their true nature. For instance, there is no venereal disease among animals in their natural state, as there is among human beings. Man, therefore, could not have inherited *sin* from an animal ancestry.

(4) To trace sin to mere animalism is superficial ethically; for sin is not primarily a physical evil, nor

a mere instinct, but a psychical decision and choice. To posit sin in the body is the old heresy of the Gnostics and Manicheans. The Biblical teaching that sin is a psychical state and act is much profounder, a wrong choice of the free will, and agrees with the testimony of conscience.

Thus the Biblical account of the origin of sin agrees with the conclusions of scientific and rational ethics: *Sin had its origin in the wrong choice of a free moral agent.* Otherwise it would not be *sin.* It might be misfortune, but would not be sin in the sense of guilt. Our very consciences—if they have not been perverted by long and persistent sin—bear witness that we are *responsible* for our wrong thoughts and deeds. The sin in the Edenic garden did not consist in the temptation, or even in the appeal which it made to our first parents; it consisted solely in their *cherishing the evil suggestion and yielding to it.*[7]

5. The History of Cain.

Where did Cain get his wife? This is one of the stock questions of infidelity.

Answer: The Bible often completes a specific narrative, and then goes back and picks up the main thread of the history. So in this case. Adam and Eve had sons and daughters and perhaps even grandchildren long before the story of Cain was finished. Josephus even mentions the sons and daughters of Adam and Eve before he relates the history of Cain. So Cain mar-

[7] A vindication of the historical character of the third chapter of Genesis—the account of the fall of man—is given in the author's book: *Man's First Disobedience* (1924).

ried one of his relatives. Where else could a man have gotten a wife in the primeval history of the human family, which science tells us had a single origin?

6. The Noachian Deluge.

Almost all nations and tribes have traditions of a general flood which destroyed nearly the whole human family. The flood of Noah's time will afford a solid historical basis for these traditions. They could hardly have arisen without some historical groundwork. The remains of ocean life are often found on the tops of high mountains, proving that at some time they were submerged. The ark itself has been found to have been of the proper dimensions for seafaring when speed was no object, but when space and safety were the chief purposes.

Some evangelical scholars contend that the Noachian deluge was universal; others that it was only of sufficient extent to destroy the human family, with the exception of Noah and his household. Good reasons may be adduced for both views, and it is not necessary here to decide between them.[8]

7. Israel's Crossing the Red Sea.

The late Professor George Frederick Wright,[9] the eminent scientist and explorer, made a thorough inves-

---

[8] Cf. the following books which confirm the factuality of the Noachian deluge; Townsend: *The Deluge: History or Myth?* Wright: *Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History,* Chapter VI, XI; Price: *The New Geology* (consult the Index); Keil: *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (*in loco*); Finn: *The Creation, Fall and Deluge.*

[9] *Ibid,* Chapter IV.

tigation of the localities of the Exodus, and found that such parting of the waters as the Bible describes was possible and probable if God found it necessary to perform the miracle to preserve His people from destruction. Had He not done so, what would have become of His plan of salvation through Christ? The Bible says that God used secondary causes to part the waters (Ex. 14:21): "And Jehovah caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all the night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided." But the fact in no wise destroys its supernatural character. A mere natural windstorm could not account for all the phenomena depicted in this narrative.

CHAPTER XX

II. THE DOUBTER'S DIFFICULTIES (*continued*).

8. God's Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart.

The Bible says several times that Pharaoh hardened his own heart before it says that God hardened it. According to immutable laws (which God Himself has established), people's characters do become fixed in evil when they continue to sin. Thus it can be said in one sense that people harden their own hearts and in another that God hardens them. So with Pharaoh. Thus the Bible agrees with the well-known facts of psychology.[1]

9. Slaughter of the Canaanites.

The Bible says that this occurred because "the cup of their iniquity was full." Note what God Himself said to the Israelites (Deut. 9:4): "Speak not thou in thine heart, after that the Lord thy God hath cast them (the Canaanites) out before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to possess this land; but for the *wickedness* of these nations the Lord doth drive them out from before thee."

[1] Cf. James G. Murphy: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Exodus*, p. 37; C. F. Keil: *Commentary on the Pentateuch, in loco.*

Read also the following passages depicting the debased character of the Canaanites and pointing out the cause of their destruction: "Defile not yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: And the land is defiled: therefore, I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants. Ye shall, therefore, keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations . . . that the land spew you not out also, as it spewed out the nations that were before you" (Lev. 18:24-28). Verses 22 and 23 portray some of these people's gross immoralities.

The situation morally was the same as in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and the wicked antedeluvians. The Bible never says that God destroyed or punished a *righteous* nation, but only nations that had become *too corrupt to continue to exist.*

What a warning to nations today! "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people" (Prov. 14:34); "By the blessing of the upright the city is exalted; but it is overthrown by the mouth of the wicked" (Prov. 11:11); "The wicked shall be turned into sheol, even all the nations that forget God" (Ps. 9:17).

Unbelievers seem to spend much time finding fault with the God of the Bible because He destroyed wicked people, and sometimes their children with them; but they never appear to remember that the God of nature has wiped out many iniquitous nations in the past, like the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Romans. They

pass by all the casualties of the natural world with perfect nonchalance, but rage against the Bible for recording the same kinds of catastrophes. They should be consistent. The only place in which we read that God is a holy, righteous and beneficent God is in the Bible.

10. JONAH AND THE WHALE.[2]

Neither the Hebrew of the Old Testament nor the Greek of the New says that this creature was a "whale"; in each case the original word means a "sea monster." Sharks in the Mediterranean Sea can easily swallow a man whole, as has been observed in more than one instance. Even whales have lately been found in the ocean with throats of great size.

The miracle did not consist in the swallowing of the prophet, but in his preservation in the monster's stomach. This is no more wonderful than many other miracles recorded in the Bible.

Objection is sometimes made that the incident is grotesque; but we reply that there are some grotesque objects in nature, which God has created. George Adam Smith, in "The Expositor's Bible," will not admit the historicity of this book, but regards it as inspired allegory. If, however, it is to be rejected as history be-

---

[2] Cf. McGarvey: *Jesus and Jonah;* Wilson: *The Authenticity of Jonah, in The Princeton Theological Review,* April and July, 1918; Keil: *Commentary on the Minor Prophets;* Orelli: *The Twelve Minor Prophets;* Kennedy: *The Book of Jonah;* Keyser: *Contending for the Faith,* Chap. VIII; Sampey: Article on Jonah in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia;* W. C. Stevens: *The Unique Historical Value of the Book of Jonah* (1924).

cause it is grotesque, how does it help matters to charge the Holy Spirit with leading the writer to invent a grotesque situation in composing an allegory? The Modernists are not consistent reasoners.

The performance of the miracle may readily be justified as worth-while on the ground that it saved the great city of Nineveh, and teaches the paramount truth that God desires to save all people if they will repent. The book also teaches, and this is most important, that men should never attempt to run away from God's call to service and duty. Another impressive truth taught in this book is that Jehovah was not a mere Jewish Deity, a mere "tribal god," but the God of all nations. All through subsequent history these great lessons have been impressed on men's minds by this unique and inspired book.

11. The Imprecatory Psalms.

The word "imprecatory" means invoking evil or punishment. Some of the Psalms seem to breathe a somewhat vindictive spirit toward the writer's enemies. He calls down God's judgments upon them, and sometimes the personal element seems to be implied in the language employed. These Psalms have been a serious gravamen with unbelievers and scoffers.

What shall be said in reply? First, it is true, a bad meaning *may* be read into these expressions if one is so disposed, and especially if one, instead of taking into account the whole spirit and teaching of the Bible, is inclined to cavil about technical points. But there is a larger way of interpreting these passages—a way,

too, that agrees with the whole analogy of faith in the Holy Scriptures. If they are regarded as divinely inspired, they express, not the Psalmist's personal resentment, but God's righteous reaction against sin. No one could respect a God who does not hate and punish sin, which is the cause of all evil and suffering.

12. Apparent Discrepancies in the Bible.[3]

Most of them have been successfully explained. The trouble is, the skeptics and liberalistic critics pay no attention to scholarly defenses of the Bible, but go on repeating their stock objections over and over again. The same contradictions that Driver, Cheyne, Bade and others herald forth can be found in Paine's *The Age of Reason*, in the works of the deists and of Voltaire and other infidels of past ages.

The more, however, we know of the Hebrew and cognate languages, of archeology, history and geography in ancient times, the more these difficulties disappear. Perhaps not all of them have as yet been cleared up, but that very fact keeps men constantly studying the Bible with deeper interest. Infidels and negative critics should read the works of the scholars who have specialized in resolving Biblical difficulties.

13. Why God Permits Sin and Suffering.[4]

Let it be remembered that the Bible is not the *cause* of sin and suffering. They are here whether the Bible is true or not. If the Bible should be utterly dis-

---

[3] In the Selected Bibliography, see Tuck, Torrey, Drawbridge, Winnington-Ingram, Gray, Stroh, Ardnt.

[4] Cf. Keyser: *A System of General Ethics* (fourth edition), pp. 122-133; *A System of Natural Theism*, pp. 130-139.

carded by everybody, sin and suffering would still remain in the world. Whoever or whatever made or evolved the world permitted sin and sorrow to come into it and mar it.

God permitted *sin* because He did not want to make man a mere machine, animal or automaton, but a free moral agent. Emerson puts it finely:

> "He who ruleth high and wise,
> Nor pauseth in His plan,
> Will tear the sun out of the skies
> Ere freedom out of man." [5]

God may permit suffering for one of two reasons: First, as a punishment for sin, in which case it is condign; second, as discipline for His people: "I will refine them as silver is refined, and try them as gold is tried" (Zach. 13:9); "Every branch in me that beareth fruit." He cleanseth it that it may bring forth more fruit." God also promises in the Bible that our reward shall be much greater in the future on account of our afflictions here (Rom. 8:18; 2 Cor. 4:17). Such assurances ought to help to "justify the ways of God to man."

14. Miracles in General.[6]

The supernatural element in the Bible has brought against it the opposition of both infidels and rationalists.

---

[5] In its context Emerson was referring more to political freedom than to mere psychical and moral freedom, but his quatrain makes a striking epigram for freedom in general.

[6] Cf. Wendland's cogent work: *Miracles and Christianity*, translated by H. R. Mackintosh; also the following authors in the Selected Bibliography: Brockingham, D'Arcy, Hitchcock, Lamb, Christlieb.

The person who believes in God ought to have no trouble in believing that He would perform miracles at certain crucial and strategic epochs in the history of the world. How else could God clearly make Himself known to men? Why should He make a world and then hide Himself in it or behind it, or entangle Himself in mere natural law?

Again, the world could not have created itself, nor could it have come by chance, nor could it be eternal. Note all the logical and philosophical reasons for these statements in the works on Natural Theism cited in our Bibliography. Hence, the world must have come into existence by creation, which would have been a wonderful miracle to begin with. If the cosmos came into existence by a miracle, why should miracles never occur afterward? And when man fell into sin and peril, why would not God come to his rescue to save him and repair the damage done?

When a mechanician's machine gets out of repair, he proceeds to mend it—if it is worth mending. Are men wiser than God? Are they more beneficent? To our mind, it is wholly within the bounds of reason to believe that God would now and then give a special display of His power, personality and love.

The question is often asked, "Why does not God perform miracles today as He did in Biblical times?" Perhaps He does perform miracles today, only in a different way, because our needs are different. We are ready however, to admit that miracles, especially physical miracles, are not in evidence today as much as they were in certain epochs of Biblical history. The reason

may be that God performs miracles only at crucial times, and thus is properly economical of them for wise purposes. For example, after the six creative eras described in the first two chapters of Genesis, He ceased to perform miracles of creation, "rested" from that kind of work (Gen. 2:1-3), and proceeded to unfold the world according to its own laws under His superintendence.

Then, a careful reading of the Bible as a whole shows that miracles came only at certain critical exigencies, and were always followed by long periods of development. When His chosen people reached an emergency in which His plan of redemption (which He had decreed from eternity) was endangered, He had to intervene, or else His gracious purpose would have been frustrated.

Then, when the Son of God came out of the infinite realm into the realm of time and space for man's redemption, He performed miracles in order to attest His divine commission and to do good to suffering people around Him, thus revealing His character of Lover, Lord and Saviour. It was reasonable, too, that He should meet the spiritual adversaries of mankind in the open arena, in order to prove His complete mastery over them. This thought may suggest why there were demoniacs in the days of our Lord here on earth.

Having established His teaching among His disciples, however, having planted the seed of the Gospel, having laid the foundations of His kingdom, He retired again into the invisible realm and poured out His Spirit upon His Church. As soon as the Church was fully

established by His inspired apostles, and the spiritual dispensation was fully inaugurated, outward wonders naturally ceased, and men became convicted, convinced and converted through the inner power and witness of the Holy Spirit, in connection with the inspired Word of God.

Why should God perform miracles nowadays at every skeptic's beck? All who are willing may receive the inner assurance of truth and salvation through the Holy Spirit. Is not testimony within the soul as convincing as the testimony of the outer senses? Those who demand physical wonders in this dispensation of the Holy Ghost simply advertise their lack of spiritual insight and experience. The present dispensation of the Spirit will in all probability continue until the next epoch in God's program, which will doubtless be Christ's second advent and final judgment.

Moreover, if miracles were constantly performed, they would cease to be miracles, and thus there would be no regular and reliable order of things. If God would perform miracles for one man, He would have to do so for all the rest. That would make a strange world, indeed. There is a wise frugality of miracles in God's program, and we are glad it is so.

15. Why the Bible is not Perfectly Plain.

We reply with several other relevant questions: Why is not nature perfectly plain and simple? Why are not physical science, mathematics, psychology and philosophy perfectly simple and plain? The God of the Bible acts very much like the God of nature and

reason. Only the physical and mental sluggard wants a perfect, simple and easy world.

Then, too, if the Bible were like a primer, it would have become outgrown and obsolete long ago. People do not keep on studying the primary readers of their childhood. If they preserve them at all, they are only relics and curios. In some ways the Bible is plain enough, indeed, so "plain that wayfaring men, though fools, need not err therein" (Isa. 35:8). In other ways it is very deep, just like nature, and thus keeps us continually interested in sounding its profound meanings and practicing its challenging injunctions.

Part V

THE FAILURE OF INFIDELITY

CHAPTER XXI

I. PERTINENT OBSERVATIONS.

1. Infidelity Aggressive and Critical.

Infidelity has been chiefly noted for its attacks on Christianity. It has ever been the main aggressor. This has put the Christian apologist constantly on the defensive, which position is always more or less of a disadvantage. Surely the Christian advocate has a right at times to change the mode of warfare, and to carry on an aggressive campaign; that is, as it were, invade the enemy's territory. Infidelity has been in the world a long time, ever since the unbelieving Jews and Romans opposed and crucified Christ; ever since the days of Celsus, Lucian, Hierocles and Porphyry.

2. It Must be Asked to Make Good.

Now, since it is a historical movement, the Christian has a perfect right to ask what infidelity has done for the betterment of the world and the comfort of

human hearts. How many men and women has it rescued from sin and transformed in life and character? How many beneficent institutions has it built, and how many is it maintaining today? Where are the colleges and universities of organized infidelity in this country and other lands? Where are its great institutions of mercy? Where are its great works of art, architecture, music and poetry?

Has it been so busy finding flaws in the Bible, Christianity and the Christian Church that it has had no time or disposition to build enduring and constructive monuments to its wisdom and altruistic spirit? A critic invites criticism of himself. It is to be feared that when infidelity is challenged and put on the defensive, and is asked to make a showing of its achievements, it will be able to make but a feeble apology for itself. It will be our duty—not a pleasant one—to point out the weakness of infidelity.

Before we proceed further with this thesis, we must, in perfect fairness, speak of some things that unbelievers have done as individuals.

II. ACHIEVEMENTS OF INFIDELS.

1. In the Field of Literature.

It would not be true to say that individual unbelievers have made no contributions to the world's knowledge. In an organized capacity they have done little; for they seem to lack the quality of teamwork. But here and there an individual has done things that are worthy of recognition.

Lucretius, of the first century of the Christian era, wrote a didactic poem in six books, entitled *De Rerum Natura* (*Concerning the Nature of Things*), in which he set forth the cosmical principles of the Epicurean philosophy.

For its time it displayed much knowledge of nature, was expressed in forcible language, and evinced some originality of imagination. But even here, much as we might like to give unqualified praise, it must be said that the work was thoroughly materialistic, and was intended to destroy faith in supernatural beings. No one has ever been rescued from sin and misery by this work. The work embodied no high moral principles and ideals.

The French infidels of Voltaire's day produced a great work called *The French Encyclopedia*, in which they gathered vast knowledge for the day; and much of it was true and useful. But it was honeycombed with materialism and religious negation, so that it was more destructive than constructive, especially in philosophy and religion. Whatever else may be said of the work, it contained little that was morally uplifting.

All of us are ready to acknowledge the worth of the writings of Hume, Gibbon and Hobbes, the first two in their histories of England and Rome, respectively, and the last in his *Leviathan*, a philosophical work of some depth. But even these men, profound as they were, lacked something to give the world moral incentive. They did much, too, to negative faith in the foundations of morality and religion.

In the domain of statesmanship Thomas Paine wrote some books that contributed a good deal to the independence of the United States. For this reason Americans remember him with gratitude. His works are read very little nowadays, but at one time they exerted a powerful influence. Their titles are *Common Sense*, *The Crisis* and *The Rights of Man*, all of which struck a high note for human freedom. However, Paine destroyed almost all his influence and lost nearly all his friends by assaulting the chief bulwark of our American liberty and civilization—the Christian religion. Besides, his conduct was so erratic that he could not retain his friends.

John Stuart Mill, a rationalist, though profound and brilliant, was not helpful along the line of constructive thought and moral stimulus.

2. In the Field of Science and Invention.

In this domain some agnostics have made more or less notable contributions. In some ways Darwin, Huxley and Spencer added to our knowledge of science. As long as they remain in the empirical realm, they were no doubt fairly safe guides. But when they entered the field of philosophical speculation, as they so frequently did, they went far astray, and have imposed upon the world a naturalistic theory that has done much to undermine morality and religion, to lower men's ideals, and make them of the earth, earthy. With many people the idea of man's brute origin has taken the place of the higher conception that man was created in the image of God. Thus we cannot help

feeling that the work of these great agnostics was much more negative than positive.

It is a sad thing to have to say that Thomas A. Edison in the later years of his life joined the unbelievers, teaching that atoms have mentality, and that when they come together in organic relation in the human brain, they form the human mind, but when they are dissolved, the human soul is also dispersed. Thus personal, conscious immortality for man is denied.

His constructive work lies in the field of electrical discovery and invention. Here he has accomplished wonders, and has contributed much to human welfare on the physical and earthly side; perhaps some, too, on the intellectual and esthetic side. If he had put his influence and talents on the side of moral and spiritual construction, how much good of the highest kind he might have achieved![1]

Thus we have tried to be fair by acknowledging the positive work that infidels and agnostics have done along certain lines. This work they have done as independent individuals. In pointing out, as we shall do next, the shortcomings of infidelity, we refer to its influence and work as an organized force. This is

---

[1] In utmost fairness we are led to say that we have read somewhere quite recently (although at present we cannot lay our hand on the reference) that Mr. Edison had come out in defense of theism and religion. He recognized their morally elevating and safe-guarding character. In a popular magazine he published an article in favor of man's immortality, showing that reason and justice demand a future life. If some of the sequoia trees of California live three thousand years, it is unreasonable to believe that rational personalities live less than a hundred years: so argued Edison.

fair, for all along we have been treating Christianity and the total teaching and power of the Bible in this organic way.

III. THE WEAKNESS OF INFIDELITY.

1. It Builds no Enduring Institutions.

Where are its colleges, its hospitals, its constructive works? The Christian religion, founded solely on the Bible, has built many colleges and other institutions of higher education; they dot the land from ocean to ocean. Where have the organized free-thinkers a first-class college in all this country? Christians have erected many temples at great cost and sacrifice for the worship of God and the promulgation of Christian principles. Infidelity has scarcely a respectable hall in the country. It is destructive rather than constructive.

2. It Creates no Helpful Literature.

Some erratic works of genius have been produced by men of skeptical tendencies, but few that have really been a moral uplift and inspiration to the race. Thousands of people have been converted, and lifted from the ways of sin through Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Spurgeon's sermons, Krummacher's *The Suffering Saviour*, and other Christian works. How many people have been transformed from bad people to upright people through the writings of Celsus, Porphyry, Newport, Voltaire, Paine and Bradlaugh? We must ask them to bring forward their "twice-born men."

3. It Has Produced no Great Works of Art.

Most of these have been painted or chiselled by believers; few, if any, by pronounced infidels. It is true, there is a heathen or classical art like that of the Greeks and the Romans; but even this has almost all been produced in the interest of religion—at least, all that is of abiding worth. Nor has unbelief erected any great works of architecture. On the other hand, note the great churches and cathedrals of Christian nations. Why are Christian people so much more in earnest than infidels? Because they have something positive to believe, to which to cling, and which to promulgate.

Infidelity has failed to create any great and inspiring music—no hymns, no glorias, no oratorios. There are no Handels, Haydns and Beethovens in the ranks of boasting infidelity. It is chiefly iconoclastic.

4. It Raises Doubts but Solves no Vital Problems.

Suppose that unbelief should cause universal rejection of the Bible, would that solve a single deep and vital problem of the human soul? Look at some of these problems: How shall we account for the origin of the universe, of man, of sin, of evil? What is the reason for suffering? What is matter in its elemental essence? What is mind? How are mind and matter correlated in the human brain? Is man immortal? What comes after death?

These are serious, yes they are solemn and vital questions. They are questions of the intellect and of the heart. *They will not down.* Should an unbeliever assert that they are useless questions, his statement

would prove, *ipso facto*, that he has not an earnest and profound mind, but thinks and feels superficially. Now go over the above interrogations again. Will any of them be answered by repudiating Christianity? Not one. They will remain in all their blank mysterious baldness.

But let us put the matter positively: If you accept Christianity, you have the solution of your problems now, or the promise of their solution by and by. Note the inspiriting promise: "Now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face." That means a direct vision of all reality. Here is another assurance of the same invigorating character: "Beloved, it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is" (1 John 3:2). Again this means perfect beatific vision. What can infidelity offer in the place of these assurances?

5. Its Doctrine of Man Is One-Sided.

It makes man a "torso"—that is, it treats him as if he were only physical, or, at most, only physical and intellectual, and overlooks or disregards the highest and noblest part of his being, namely, his spiritual faculty, the religious sense, with which he is allied to God. Not so with the Bible, which teaches that man is "body, soul and spirit," and declares that "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come" (1 Tim. 4:8).

6. It Lacks Moral Dynamic.

Knowing nothing of the regeneration and reconstruction of human nature by divine grace, it simply leaves man to struggle with sin and suffering in his innately weak and depraved condition. It even rejects, willfully or otherwise, the help that God proffers in the contest. It destroys faith, and gives nothing assuring in its stead. It robs man of the hope of immortality, and provides no substitute. It derides the plan of salvation, but provides no antidote for sin. Morally and spiritually it has and knows no remedial system for the sickness of the soul.

In contrast, note that Christianity has a remedy for the ills of life, and one that is effective when truly applied; it is not a mere nostrum, but a specific.

7. It Saps the Foundations of Morality.[2]

In this case we refer to materialists, who deny the existence of God. It should be borne in mind that not all infidels are atheists. Speaking now of materialism, that class philosophy obscures, if it does not repudiate, moral distinctions. If there is no God, where is there any ground of right? Morality can be predicated only of rational personalities; then the ultimate ground of right must be a Person; if it is *not*, there is no morality.

Says Goldwin Smith: "The denial of the exist-

[2] It would be worth while to read in this connection Bishop Horne's *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures*, Vol. 1, pp. 22-26, on the moral principles, teaching and lives of the leading unbelievers of his times.

ence of God and of a future state is, in a word, the dethronement of conscience."

It is true, many unbelievers do not go so far as to deny the existence of God, but most of them relegate Him so far from their lives and thoughts as to render His influence upon them negligible. Hence they imperil the foundations of morality. Often they are decent citizens and affable neighbors, and even kind-hearted to the needy and suffering; but they seldom live great and inspiring lives. Conventional morality is all they can claim.

But Christianity requires inner rightness with God, who sees the heart and knows the motives. "Hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before Him, because, if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things" (1 John 3:19, 20).

8. A Parallel and a Contrast.

Christianity	*Unbelief*
Gives assurances of truth.	Fills with uncertainty.
Knows and loves God.	Is agnostic regarding God.
Recognizes sin and its defilement.	Ignores or minimizes sin.
Offers and confers salvation.	Is negative and powerless.
Inculcates the highest morality.	Often lowers the moral standard.
Gives moral dynamic through divine grace.	Leaves men in his weakness.
Is constructive in vital life	Is negative and destructive.
Gives comfort in sorrow.	Affords no comfort.
Gives joy and triumph in death.	No victory but often fear.
Gives assurance of immortality.	Is nihilistic or agnostic.
Promises new heavens and a new earth.	Offers even no conjecture.
Promises final solution of all problems.	Leaves all a blank.

Striking a balance between these two columns, which side offers the weightier reasons for acceptance? Christianity is a system of *position;* unbelief a welter of *negation.* Do not let any man tear down your house until you are sure he can erect a better one in its stead. Do not let any man destroy your Christian faith and hope until he can put something better in their place. "Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good" (1 Thess. 5:21).

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many excellent books on Christian Apologetics have been published. The following list may seem to be quite formidable; but even at that it does not profess to be exhaustive. Our selection is not meant to discriminate against other works that are not listed here; those that are omitted may be as worthy as these.

The list here given is intended to guide those who may wish to carry their investigations further. The footnotes in the text are intended for the same purpose. Another reason for publishing so extended a list is to impress upon believers and unbelievers alike the fact—a fact all should note—that the evangelical faith has not lacked competent upholders through the years. How many unbelievers and liberalists have read these scholarly works, or even a few of them? Men who pose as scholars and fair-minded persons should read books on both sides of the question.

GENERAL APOLOGETICS

AUBERLEN, C. A.: *The Divine Revelation: An Essay in Defense of the Faith.*

BISSELL, E. C.: *The Historic Origin of the Bible* (1889).

CAIRNS, D. S.: *The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith.*

CHRISTLER, T.: *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief* (second enlarged edition, 1874).

COLGRAVE, B. and SHORT, A. R.: *The Historic Faith in the Light of Today* (1922).

EBRARD, J. H. A.: *Christian Apologetics, or, The Scientific Vindication of Christianity* (3 vols).

FAIRBAIRN, A. M.: *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (last edition, 1909).

FISHER, G. P.: *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief* (1911).

FRANK, F. H.: *A System of Christian Certainty.*

INGRAM, A. T. W.: *Reasons for Faith and Other Contributions to Christian Evidence* (1910-1914).

LINDBERG, C. E.: *Apologetics: A System of Christian Evidence* (1917).

LORAINE, N.: *The Battle of Belief: A Review of the Present Conflict* (fourth edition, 1911).

LUTHARDT, C. E.: *Fundamental, Moral and Saving Truths of Christianity* (3 vols.).

MCGARVEY, J. W.: *Evidences of Christianity* (1912).

MULLINS, E. Y.: *Why Is Christianity True? Christian Evidences* (1905).

ORR, J.: *The Christian View of God and the World* (ninth edition, 1908).

STEARNS, L. F.: *The Evidence of Christian Experience* (1890).

STORRS, R. S.: *The Divine Origin of Christianity* (1884).

GOOD HANDBOOKS

FISHER, G. P.: *Manual of Christian Evidences.*

KENNEDY, J.: *A Popular Handbook of Christian Evidences.*

ROW, C. A.: *A Manual of Christian Evidences.*

STEWART, A.: *Handbook of Christian Evidences.*

WELLS, A. R.: *Why We Believe the Bible* (1910).

SPECIAL APOLOGIES

ANDREWS, S. J.: *Christianity and Anti-Christianity in Their Final Conflict* (1898).

BEECHER, W. J.: *The Prophets and the Promise.*

BIRKS, T. R.: *Horae Evangelicae: Internal Evidence of the Gospel History* (1902).

BROCKINGTON, A. A.: *Old Testament Miracles in the Light of the Gospel.*

BURRELL, D. J.: *Why I Believe the Bible* (1917).

CARRINGTON, P.: *Christian Apologetics in the Second Century* (1921).

DORCHESTER, D.: *Christianity Vindicated by Its Enemies* (1896); *Concessions of Liberalists to Orthodoxy.*

DRAWBRIDGE, C. L.: *Common Objections to Christianity* (fifth thousand, 1914).

FAULKNER, J. A.: *Modernism and the Christian Faith* (1921).

FINN, A. H.: *The Silences of Scripture: Evidence of the Purpose and Plan of the Bible.*

FITCHETT, W. H.: *The Beliefs of Unbelief* (1917).

GIBSON, J. M.: *The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture.*

GRAY, J. M.: *Primers of the Faith* (1906).

GRIFFINHOOFE, C. G.: *Helps Toward Belief in the Christian Faith.*

HENSLOW, G.: *Present-day Rationalism Critically Examined.*

HITCHCOCK, F. R. M.: *The Present Controversy on the Gospel Miracles* (1915).

JOHNSON, H.: *Christianity's Challenge.*

LEWIS, H.: *Modern Rationalism as Seen at Work in Its Biographies* (1913).

MAURO, P.: *The World and Its God* (third revised edition, 1917).

MCCLURE, E.: *Modern Substitutes for Traditional Christianity* (1913).

MOZLEY, J. K.: *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages; Lectures on the Old Testament.*

MULLINS, E. Y.: *Freedom and Authority in Religion* (1913).

NELSON, D.: *The Cause and Cure of Infidelity* (new edition, 1926).

ORR, JAMES: *Revelation and Inspiration* (1910).

PAUL, J.: *What Is New Theology?* (1921).

REED, L. A.: *Astronomy and the Bible* (1919).

RILEY, W. B.: *The Menace of Modernism* (1917).

SIMPSON, A. B.: *The Old Faith and the New Gospels* (1911).

STEEL, S. A.: *The Modern Theory of the Bible* (1921).

STUART, M.: *The Bible True to Itself.*

STUBB, J. A. O.: *Verbal Inspiration* (1913).

TANNEHILL, J. B.: *Noamah and Nimrods: A Defense of the Faith of Our Fathers* (1916).

TRUMBULL, H. C.: *How to Deal With Doubts and Doubters* (1907).

WACE, H.: *Christianity and Agnosticism* (1905).

WACE, H., and OTHERS: *Creative Christianity* (1921).

WARFIELD, B. B.: *Counterfeit Miracles* (1918).

BIBLICAL CRITICISM

BARTLETT, S. C.: *The Veracity of the Hexateuch* (1897).

BAXTER, W. L.: *Sanctuary and Sacrifice.*

BEATTIE, F. R.: *Radical Criticism: An Exposition and Examination* (1894).

BISSELL, E. C.: *The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure* (1885).

Burns, W. H.: *The Higher Critic's Bible or God's Bible* (1904).

David, J. D.: *A Dictionary of the Bible* (new edition, 1928; see isagogical articles).

Finn, A. H.: *The Unity of the Pentateuch* (1914); *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch.*

Griffith, J. S.: *The Problem of Deuteronomy* (1911).

Hengstenberg, E. W.: *Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch* (1847).

Johnson, F.: *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old* (1895).

Johnston, H. A.: *Biblical Criticism and the Average Man* (1902).

Keil, K. T.: *Historico-Critical Introduction to the Old Testament.*

Kennedy, J.: *Old Testament Criticism and the Rights of the Unlearned.*

Knowling, R. J.: *Literary Criticism of the New Testament* (1907).

Leathes, S.: *The Law and the Prophets; Claims of the Old Testament.*

Machen, J. G.: *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (1921).

Munroe, J. A.: *The Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism* (1911).

Nicoll, W. R.: *The Church's One Foundation* (1905).

Noesgen, C. A.: *The New Testament and the Pentateuch* (1905).

Orr, J.: *The Problem of the Old Testament* (1911).

Ovenden, C. T.: *Modern Criticism of the Holy Scriptures* (1913).

RAVEN, J. H.: *Old Testament Introduction, General and Special.*

REDPATH, H. A.: *Modern Criticism of the Book of Genesis* (second edition, 1906).

REICH, E.: *The Failure of the Higher Criticism of the Bible* (1905).

ROBERTSON, A. T.: *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research* (1920); *Paul the Interpreter of Christ* (1921).

ROBERTSON, J.: *The Early Religion of Israel* (two volumes).

ROUSE, G. H.: *Old Testament Criticism in New Testament Light.*

SPENCER, F. E.: *Did Moses Write the Pentateuch After All?* (1901).

STUART, T. M.: *Divine Inspiration Versus the Documentary Theory of the Higher Criticism.*

THOMAS, J.: *The Organic Unity of the Pentateuch* (1904).

THORBURN, J.: *The Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels* (1906).

TOWNSEND, L. T.: *The Story of Jonah and Higher Criticism.*

TROELSTRA, A.: *The Name of God in the Pentateuch* (1912).

URQUHART, J.: *The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scriptures* (1895); *The New Biblical Guide: Recent Discoveries and the Bible* (8 vols.).

VEDDER, H. C.: *The Johannine Writings and the Johannine Problem* (1917).

WACE, H.: *The Bible and Modern Investigation; Prophecy, Jewish and Christian* (1911).

WHITELAW, T.: *The Old Testament Problem.*

WIENER, H. M.: *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism* (1909); *The Origin of the Pentateuch* (1910); *Pentateuchal Studies* (1912).

WILKINSON, W. C.: *Paul and the Revolt Against Him* (1914).

WILSON, R. D.: *Studies in the Book of Daniel* (1917).

ZAHN, T.: *Introduction to the New Testament* (second edition, translated, 1917).

SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY

AZBILL, W. K.: *Science and Faith* (1914).

BAVINCK, H.: *The Philosophy of Revelation.*

BETTEX, F.: *Science and Christianity; The First Page of the Bible; The Six Days of Creation in the Light of Modern Science.*

COCKER, B. F.: *Christianity and Greek Philosophy* (1872).

DAWSON, J. W.: *Modern Ideas of Evolution as Related to Revelation and Science* (sixth edition).

DENNERT, E.: *At the Deathbed of Darwinism* (1904).

EVERETT, C. C.: *Theism and the Christian Faith* (1909).

GRAEBNER, T.: *Evolution: An Investigation and a Criticism* (1921; second edition, 1926).

GRUBER, L. F.: *Whence Came the Universe?* (new edition of *Creation Ex Nihilo*, 1922).

HAAS, J. A. W.: *Trends of Thought and Christian Truth* (1915).

HEAGLE, D.: *The Lord God of Elijah* (1916).

HOLBROOK, D. G.: *The Panorama of Creation* (1908).

HUELSTER, A.: *Miracles in the Light of Science and History* (1915).

JOHNSON, W. H.: *The Christian Faith Under Modern Searchlights* (1916).

JONES, D. A.: *Philosophic Thought and Religion* (1919).

MCCOSH, J.: *Christianity and Positivism: Lectures on Natural Theology and Apologetics.*

MILLER, J. H.: *The Bible of Nature and the Bible of Grace* (1919).

NEWTON, J.: *The Problem of Personality.*

PRICE, G. M.: *Q.E.D.: New Light on the Doctrine of Creation* (1917); *God's Two Books: Plain Facts About Evolution, Geology and the Bible* (1911); *Back to the Bible* (new and revised edition, 1920).

SHELDON, H. C.: *Unbelief in the Nineteenth Century* (1917); *Pantheistic Dilemmas and Other Essays in Philosophy and Religion* (1920).

TOWNSEND, L. T.: *Evolution and Creation.*

DEFENSES OF SPECIAL DOCTRINES

BARRY, G. D.: *The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture* (1919).

BETTEX, F.: *What Think Ye of Christ?* (new edition, 1920).

Cooke, R. J.: *Doctrine of the Resurrection, Biblical, Historical and Scientific; The Incarnation and Recent Criticism* (1907).

Ellicott, C. J.: *Are We to Modify Fundamental Doctrine?*

Fairbairn, A. M.: *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology* (1911).

Heagle, D.: *Do the Dead Still Live? The Testimony of Science Respecting the Future Life* (1920).

Hopkins, M.: *The Scriptural Idea of Man* (1883).

Huffman, J. A.: *Old Testament Messages of the Christ* (1909).

Illingworth, J. R.: *The Doctrine of the Trinity Apologetically Considered* (reprint, 1909).

Kuypfer, A.: *The Work of the Holy Spirit.*

Laidlaw, J.: *The Bible Doctrine of Man.*

Mackintosh, H. R.: *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (1916); *The Originality of the Christian Message* (1920).

Mozley, J. K.: *The Doctrine of the Atonement* (1916).

Mylne, L. G.: *The Holy Trinity: The Study of the Self-Revelation of God* (1916).

Orr, J. S.: *God's Image in Man* (1905); *The Resurrection of Jesus; Revelation and Inspiration* (1910).

Pratt, S. W.: *The Deity of Christ According to the Gospel of John* (1907).

Relton: *A Study in Christology: The Problem of the Two Natures in the Person of Christ* (1917).

ROBERTS, G.: *Why We Believe that Christ Rose from the Dead* (1914).

ROBERTSON, A. T.: *The Divinity of Christ in the Gospel of John* (1916).

THOMAS, W. H. G.: *Christianity is Christ* (1919).

TISDALL, W. S.: *Mythic Christs and the True* (fifth thousand, 1917).

TORREY, R. A.: *The Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Faith* (1918); *The Real Christ* (1920).

TOWNSEND, L. T.: *Bible Inspiration; Discussion on the Trinity; Bible Theology and Modern Thought.*

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST

HALL, A. C. A.: *The Virgin Mother.*

KEYSER, L. S.: *The Rational Test, Chap. VI.; Contending for the Faith, Chap. XIII.* (1920).

KNOWLING, R. J.: *Our Lord's Virgin Birth and the Criticism of Today* (third issue, 1907).

ORR, J.: *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1907).

SWEET, L. M.: *The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ* (1907).

BIBLICAL DIFFICULTIES

GRAY, J. M.: *Bible Problems Explained* (1913).

TORREY, R. A.: *Difficulties in the Bible* (second edition, 1907).

THE BIBLE AND ARCHEOLOGY

BANKS, E. J.: *The Bible and the Spade* (1913).

BARTON, G. A.: *Archeology and the Bible* (1916; sixth edition, 1933).

BISSELL, E. C.: *Bible Antiquities: A Handbook.*

BRUGSCH, H. K.: *Egypt Under the Pharaohs.*

CLAY, A. T.: *Light on the Old Testament from Babel* (1906).

COBERN, C. M.: *The New Archeological Discoveries and Their Bearing on the New Testament* (1917).

CONDER, C. R.: *The Tell el Amarna Tablets; The Bible and the East; The Hittites and Their Language.*

DAVIES, W. W.: *The Codes of Hammurabi and Moses* (1905).

HOMMEL, F.: *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as Illustrated by the Monuments* (1897).

HOSKINS, F. E.: *From the Nile to Nebo:* A Discussion of the Problem and Route of the Exodus (1912).

KNIGHT, G. A. F.: *Nile and Jordan* (1921).

KOENIG, E.: *The Bible and Babylon.*

KYLE, M. G.: *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments* (1921); *Moses and the Monuments* (1920); *The Problem of the Pentateuch* (1920).

NAVILLE, E.: *The Discovery of the Book of the Law Under King Josiah* (1911); *Archeology and the Old Testament* (1913).

PRICE, I. M.: *The Monuments and the Old Testament* (new edition, 1925).

SAYCE, A. H.: *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments; Monument Facts and Higher Critical Theories; The Hittites, or, The Story of a Forgotten Empire; The Time of Isaiah; Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments.*

TOMKINS, H. G.: *The Life and Times of Joseph in the Light of Egyptian Lore.*

BOOKS ON NATURAL THEISM

BOWNE: *Studies in Theism.*

DAVIDSON: *Theism as Grounded in Human Nature.*

FLINT: *Theism; Anti-Theistic Theories.*

FORSYTH: *The Justification of God* (1917).

HARRIS: *The Philosophical Basis of Theism.*

KELLY: *Rational Necessity of Theism* (1909).

KEYSER: *A System of Natural Theism* (1917).

KLINGMAN: *God Is* (1929).

MANESS: *Evidences of Divine Being* (1935).

MOZLEY: *The Doctrine of God* (1928).

PRINGLE-PATTISON: *The Idea of God in the Light of Recent Philosophy* (1917).

TIGERT: *Theism: A Survey of the Paths that Lead to God.*

WARD: *Naturalism and Agnosticism; The Realm of Ends.*

OLDER APOLOGIES

The older Apologies, dealing with English Deism, French Atheism and General Infidelity, though out of date in some respects, may still be read with much profit. They prove how God raised up valiant defenders of the faith in those trying days. We give a number of eminent names, with titles in special cases.

Halyburton, Cudworth, Bentley, Samuel Clarke, Conybeare, Lardner, Bishop Horne: *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures;* Butler: *The Analogy;* Paley, Whately, M'Ilvaine, Watson: *An Apology in reply to Paine's The Age of Reason;* Nelson: *The Cause and Cure of Infidelity;* Gaussen: *Theopneustia; The Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures,* recently reprinted; William Lee: *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture: Its Nature and Proof;* Rawlinson: *The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records;* Gleig: *The Most Wonderful Book in the World* (reprinted, 1915); *Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity,* delivered at the University of Virginia by various eminent scholars (1850-51).

GENERAL AND SPECIAL APOLOGIES

Ahl, A. W.: *Bible Studies in the Light of Recent Research* (second edition, 1930).

Arndt, W.: *Does the Bible Contradict Itself?* (1926).

Baron, D.: *The Servant of Jehovah: An Exposition of Isaiah LIII* (1922).

Beardsley, F. G.: *The Miracles of Jesus* (1926).

Bergen, J. T.: *Evidences of Christianity* (second edition, 1924).

Biederwolf, W. E.: *Why I Know the Bible is the Word of God* (1929).

Bloore, J.: *Alternative Views of the Bible* (1925).

Brooks, K. L.: *Perplexing Passages in the Four Gospels* (undated).

Buchanan, C. H.: *A Gospel for the New Age* (1925).

Campbell, J. L.: *The Bible Under Fire* (1928).

Candler, W. A.: *Current Comments on Timely Topics* (1926).

Champion, J. B.: *The Virgin's Son* (1924).

Clay, A. T.: *The Origin of Biblical Traditions* (1923).

Conrad, A. Z.: *The Seven Finalities of Faith* (1926); *The Gospel for an Age of Thought* (1928).

Cook, C. C.: *God's Book Speaking for Itself* (1924).

Cooke, R. J.: *Did Paul Know of the Virgin Birth?* (1926).

Cooper, D. L.: *The Eternal God Revealing Himself to Suffering Israel and to Lost Humanity* (1928).

Crabb, C. V.: *Psychology's Challenge to Christianity* (1923); *Personality Prevails* (1929).

Dallmann, W.: *The Battle of the Bible with the "Bibles"* (1926).

Dana, H. E.: *The Authenticity of the Holy Scriptures* (1923); *New Testament Criticism* (1924).

Doige, R. D.: *Our Rational Faith* (1923).

Duncan, J. G.: *The Accuracy of the Old Testament* (1930).

ERICSON, W. A.: *Inspiration, History, Theory and Facts* (1928).

EVANS, W.: *What Every Christian Should Believe* (1922); *Why I Believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ* (1924).

FAULKNER, J. A.: *Burning Questions in Historic Christianity* (1930).

FINN, A. H.: *The Starting Place of Truth* (1922).

FITCHETT, W. H.: *Where the Higher Criticism Fails* (1922).

FOSTON, H. M.: *Man and the Image of God* (1930).

GAEBELEIN, A. C.: *The Angels of God* (1924); *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (1925); *Christianity or Religion?* (1927).

GAEBELEIN, F. E.: *Exploring the Bible* (1929).

GETTY, G. A.: *Foundations of Faith* (1925).

GOODCHILD, M. M.: *Can We Believe?* (1926).

GRANVILLE, W. A.: *The Fourth Dimension and the Bible* (1922).

GRIFFITH, J. S.: *The Exodus in the Light of Archeology* (1923).

GRUBER, L. F.: *What After Death?* (1925).

HAAS, J. A. W.: *The Unity of Faith and Knowledge* (1926).

HALLESBY, O.: *Why I am a Christian* (translated 1930).

HAMILTON, F. E.: *The Basis of Christian Faith* (1927).

HART-DAVIS, D. E.: *Jonah: Prophet and Patriot* (1925).

HEFFERN, A. D.: *Apology and Polemic in the New Testament* (1922).

HUFFMAN, J. A.: *The Progressive Unfolding of the Messianic Hope* (1924); *Voices from Rocks and Dust Heaps of Bible Lands* (1928).

JOHNSTON, H. A.: *Scientific Christian Thinking for Young People* (1922); *We Surely Can Believe* (1928).

KEYSER, L. S.: *Man's First Disobedience* (1924); *A Handbook of Christian Psychology* (1928); *The Philosophy of Christianity* (1928).

KYLE, M. G.: *Explorations in Sodom* (1928).

LEE, R. G.: "*Lord, I Believe*" (1927).

LINTON, I. H.: *A Lawyer and the Bible* (1929).

MACARTNEY, C. E.: *Putting on Immortality* (1925); *Christianity and Common Sense* (1927); *Paul the Man* (1928).

MACHEN, J. G.: *What is Faith?* (1925).

MACK, E.: *The Preacher's Old Testament* (1923).

MAURO, P.: *The Chronology of the Old Testament* (1922).

MCPHERSON, G. W.: *The Modern Mind and the Virgin Birth* (1923).

MELDAU, F. J.: *The Miracle Man and the Wonder Book* (1923).

MILLER, J. K.: *Two Great Plans Paralleled: Creation and Redemption* (1924).

MORRISON, G. H.: *The Significance of the Cross* (1924).

MOZLEY, J. K.: *The Doctrine of God* (1928).

MULLINS, E. Y.: *Christianity at the Crossroads* (1924).

MYERS, C.: *Dangers of Crooked Thinking* (1924).

NAVILLE, E.: *The Law of Moses* (1922); *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch* (1923).

ORAL, Z. J.: *The Resurrection of Jesus an Historical Fact* (1923).

ORMOND, A. T.: *The Philosophy of Religion* (1922).

PATTON, F. L.: *Fundamental Christianity* (1926).

PIERSON, D. L.: *Why We Believe It* (1928).

PIETERS, A.: *Facts and Mysteries of the Christian Faith* (1926).

PILTER, W. T.: *The Pentateuch: A Historical Record* (1928).

PROCTER, W. C.: *The Authenticity and Authority of the Old Testament* (1926).

RICHARDSON, E. E.: *The Philosophy of Religion* (1929).

ROBERTSON, A. T.: *The Mother of Jesus: Her Problems and Glory* (1925).

ROBERTSON, W. M.: *The Bible at the Bar* (1930).

ROGERS, C. F.: *The Case for Christianity* (1928).

SCROGGIE, W. G.: *Is the Bible the Word of God?* (1922).

SLOAN, H. P.: *Historic Christianity and the New Theology* (1922); *The Apostles' Creed* (1930).

SMITH, J. R.: *The Holy Spirit in the Gospels* (1926).

SMITH, T. J.: *Studies in Criticism and Revelation* (1925).

Sprague, F. M.: *The Bible Versus the Secretary* (1923).

Squires, W. A.: *Psychological Foundations of Religious Education* (1926).

Stevens, W. C.: *The Unique Historical Value of the Book of Jonah* (1924).

Stroh, G.: *Bible Problems Fairly Met* (1928).

Taylor, C. C.: *The Purpose of God* (1925).

Thomas, M. B.: *The Biblical Idea of God* (1924).

Thomas, W. G. H.: "*And God Spoke these Words*" (1926).

Thorston, T. C.: *The Oppression and Exodus* (1930).

Tidwell, J. B.: *Genesis: A Study of the Plan of Redemption* (1924).

Tiplady, T.: *The Influence of the Bible* (1924).

Torrey, R. A.: *Is the Bible the Inerrant Word of God?* (1922).

Victoria Institute: *Journal of Transactions* (covering many years).

Vine, W. E.: *The Divine Inspiration of the Bible* (1923).

Ward, J. W. G.: *Problems that Perplex* (1923).

Warfield, B. B.: *Revelation and Inspiration* (1927); *Biblical Doctrines* (1929).

White, W. W.: *The Resurrection Body* (1923).

Wiener, H. M.: *The Prophets of Israel in History and Criticism* (1923); *Early Hebrew History* (1924).

Wilson, R. D.: *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (1923).
Wooley, H. D.: *The Modern Bible and How Compiled* (1926).
Wychoff, A. C.: *Acute and Chronic Unbelief* (1924).

CHRISTIANITY AND NATURAL SCIENCE

Allen, F. A.: *Evolution in the Balances* (1926).
Baker, A. L., and Nichol, F. D.: *Creation—Not Evolution* (1926).
Bartioli, G.: *The Biblical Story of Creation* (1926).
Benson, C. H.: *The Earth the Theater of the Universe* (1929).
Bole, S. J.: *The Modern Triangle: Evolution, Philosophy and Criticism* (1926).
Clark, H. W.: *Back to Creationism* (1929).
Cock, R.: *Genesis Versus Evolution* (1926); *Evolution and War* (1928).
Cole, G. G.: *Creation and Science* (1927).
Davies, L. M.: *The Bible and Modern Science* (1925).
Dunham, C. F.: *Christianity in a World of Science* (1928).
Fairhurst, A.: *Atheism in our Universities* (1923).
Finn, A. H.: *The Creation, Fall and Deluge* (1923).
Gibbs, J. W.: *Evolution and Christianity* (1930).
Graebner, T.: *Essays on Evolution* (1925).
Hardie, A.: *Evolution: Is it Philosophical, Scientific and Scriptural?* (1924).
Herget, J. F.: *Questions Evolution does not Answer* (1923).
Johnson, W. H.: *Can the Christian Now Believe in Evolution?* (1926).

JOHNSON, T. C.: *God's Answer to Evolution* (1924).
KELLEY, H. A.: *A Scientific Man and the Bible* (1925).
KEYSER, L. S.: *The Problem of Origins* (1926).
KING, S. P.: *Science Versus Evolution* (1925).
LEROY, A.: *The Religion of the Primitives* (1922).
MAURO, P.: *Evolution at the Bar* (1922).
MCCANN, A. W.: *God or Gorilla* (1922).
MCMULLEN, C. B.: *The Logic of Evolution* (1925).
MORE, L. T.: *The Dogma of Evolution* (1925; the author does not expressly reject evolution, but adduces many objections to it).
MORTON, H. C.: *The Bankruptcy of Evolution* (1924).
NELSON, B. C.: *After its Kind* (second edition, 1929).
NELSON, T. H.: *The Mosaic Law in the Light of Modern Science* (1926).
NICHOL, BAKER, SHIPLEY: *Debate on Evolution* (1925).
NIMROD, G. B.: *Science, Christ and the Bible* (1929).
O'TOOLE, G. B.: *The Case Against Evolution* (1924; reprint, 1926).
PHELPS, G. F.: *The Absurdities of Evolution* (1924).
PORTER, J. W.: *Evolution—A Menace* (1922).
PRICE, G. M.: *The New Geology* (1923); *The Phantom of Organic Evolution* (1924); *The Predicament of Evolution* (1926); *Evolutionary Geology and the New Catastrophism* (1926); *A History of Some Scientific Blunders* (1930).
RILEY, W. B.: *Inspiration or Evolution* (1923).
SCHOELER, W.: *The Truth About Evolution* (1925); *A Critique of Joseph McCabe* (1929).
SHEPFER, W. H.: *The Bible and Science* (1938).
WILLIAMS, W. A.: *The Evolution of Man Scientifically Disproved* (1925).

ZELLERS, G. A.: *Reason and Evolution* (1927).
ZERBE, A. S.: *Christianity and False Evolutionism* (1925); *Evolution in a Nutshell* (1926).

EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY AND MODERNISM

BLOORE, J.: *Modernism and its Re-statement of Christian Doctrine* (1923).
BURGGRAAFF, W.: *The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America* (1928).
COATES, C. H.: *The Red Theology in the Far East* (1926).
GORDON, E.: *The Leaven of the Sadducees* (1926).
HORSCH, J.: *Modern Religious Liberalism* (second edition, 1924).
KEYSER, L. S.: *The Doctrines of Modernism* (1925); *The Conflict of Fundamentalism and Modernism* (1926).
MACHEN, J. G.: *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923).
MCCROSSAN, T. J.: *The Bible, Its Christ and Modernism* (1925).
QUICK, O. C.: *Liberalism, Modernism and Tradition* (1922).
STANFIELD, J. M.: *Modernism: What it Is and What it Does* (1927).
STRATTON, J. R., and POTTER, C. F: *Fundamentalist-Modernist Debates* (4 vols., 1924).
VARIOUS WRITERS: *Scriptural Inspiration Versus Scientific Imagination* (1922).
WOOLEY, H. D.: *The Modernist Bible and How Compiled* (1926).

BOOK LIST UP TO DATE

The following books of an apologetic character have been issued since the publication of the sixth edition of this work in September, 1935. Judging from this list, its length and its scholarly character, it would not seem to display much acumen or up-to-date knowledge for a Modernist to speak about Christian apologetics having become "bankrupt," as one has recently done!

ACWORTH, B.: *This Progress: The Tragedy of Evolution* (1934).

AMOS, C. W. A.: *Christ and the Critics* (1933).

ARNDT, W.: *Bible Difficulties* (1932).

ATKINSON, B. F. C.: *Is the Bible True?* (1934).

CARROLL, B. H.: *Inspiration of the Bible* (1933).

CARVER, W. O.: *How the New Testament Came to be Written* (1933).

DAWSON, W. B.: *The Bible Confirmed by Science* (1932).

DEWAR, D.: *Difficulties of the Evolution Theory* (1931).

DRAWBRIDGE, C. L.: *The Religion of Scientists* (1932).

DUBOSE, H. M.: *The Bible of the Ages* (1930).

EVANS, W.: *His Unchanging Word* (1933).

FAWTHROP, T. W.: *The Stones Cry Out* (1935).

FINN, A. H.: *The Author of the Pentateuch* (1931).

FLEMING, A.: *Evolution or Creation?* (1936).

GARSTANG, J.: *The Foundations of Bible History: Joshua and Judges* (1931).

GILBERT, D.: *Crucifying Christ in our Colleges* (1934).

GRAEBNER, T.: *God and the Cosmos: A Critical Analysis of Atheism* (1933).

GRONER, F. S.: *The Witness of Great Minds to Christian Verities* (1933).

HAMILTON, F. E.: *The Basis of Evolutionary Faith* (1931).

HART-DAVIES, I. E.: *The Genesis of Genesis* (1932).

HILL, G. B.: *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (1930).

HOOPER, E. R.: *Does Science Support Evolution?* (1932).

HOSTE, W.: *Studies in Bible Doctrines* (1933).

HUFFMAN, J. A.: *Biblical Confirmations from Archeology* (1931).

IRVINE, W. C.: *Heresies Exposed* (sixth edition, 1927).

JOHNSON, W. H.: *Humanism and Christian Theism* (1931).

JOHNSTON, R. D.: *Resurrection, Myth or Miracle?* (1935).

KEYSER, L. S.: *A Reasonable Faith* (1933).

KISKADDON, J. F.: *Scientific Support of Christian Doctrines* (1934).

KRETZMANN, P. E.: *The New Testament in the Light of a Believer's Research* (1934).

KYLE, M. G.: *Excavating Kirjeth-Sepher's Ten Cities* (1934).

LANGSTON, E. L.: *God and Modern Problems* (1934).

LEHMAN, C. K.: *The Inadequacy of Evolution* (1933).

MARSTON, C.: *New Bible Evidence* (1934).

NAISMITH, ARCHIE and FRASER: *God's Christ and God's Book* (1935).

MAY, J. L. (editor): *God and the Universe: The Christian Position* (1932).

NELSON, B. C.: *The Deluge Story in Stone* (1931).

ORR, JOHN: *English Deism: Its Roots and its Fruits* (1934).

PETTINGILL, W. L.: *Bible Questions Answered* (1935).

PIETERS, A.: *The Facts and Mysteries of the Christian Faith* (1933).

PRESCOTT, W. W.: *The Spade and the Bible* (1933).

PRICE, G. M.: *The Geological-Ages Hoax* (1931).

PRICE, G. M.: *Modern Discoveries which Help us to Believe* (1935).

RICHARDSON, E. E.: *The Way of the Orient* (1935).

RILEY, W. B.: *Ten Burning Questions* (1932).

RIMMER, H.: *Voices from the Silent Centuries* (1934); *The Theory of Evolution and the Facts of Science* (1935).

ROBERTSON, A. T.: *Epochs in the Life of the Apostle John* (1935).

ROBERTSON, W. M.: *The Bible at the Bar* (1934).

ROBINSON, G. L.: *The Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization* (1930).

SCHERER, G. H.: *The Eastern Color of the Bible* (1931).

SCHMIDT: *The Origin and Growth of Religion* (translated from the German, 1931).

SHEPFER, W. H.: *The Bible and Science* (1938).

SHINER, A. E.: *The Battle of Beliefs* (1931).

SHORT, A. R.: *The Bible and Modern Research* (1932).

SLOAN, H. P.: *Personality and the Fact of Christ* (1935).

TIDWELL, J. B.: *The Bible Book by Book* (1935).

TRUMPER, V. L.: *The Mirror of Egypt in the Old Testament* (1934).

VINE, W. E.: *Christ's Eternal Sonship* (1934).

WHITE, A. K.: *A Toppling Idol—Evolution* (1933).

YAHUDA, A. S.: *The Language of the Pentateuch in Relation to Egyptian* (1933); *The Accuracy of the Bible* (1935).

ZWEMER, S. M.: *The Origin of Religion* (1935).

INDEX

Abelard—52.
Agnosticism—215.
All-sidedness of Biblical teaching—86.
Animalism, primitive—233.
Anselm—51, 196.
Anti-Christian theories—198-221.
Apologetic element—25; period—47-49.
Apologetics, Christian—21, 22, 126; historical sketch—47-61, 67; the older apologetics—276.
Apologists—24, 27, 47-61.
Apology—22-23.
Apostolic and Church fathers—155-158.
Aquinas, Thomas—51, 52.
Archeology, proofs from—161-168, 179.
Aristotle—71.
Arius—50, 51.
Art, Christian and infidel compared—253.
Assurance, Biblical—88, 89, 135-137; its content—137-145; and negation—141.
Athanasius—49-51.
Atheism—29, 198.
Augustine—49, 50, 143.
Authenticity, Biblical—74.
Autographs, the original of the Bible—150.
Babylonian myths—162, 163.
Barnabas, Epistle of—156.
Bernard of Clairvaux—51, 52.
Bible, the, a special divine revelation—69-188; a good book—131, 142; the canon—132, 133; world view—185-188; doctrine of God—186; doctrine of man—188.
Book, why God made a—71, 72.
Bricks without straw—164.
Buddhism—87, 93.
Bunyan, John—143.
Butler, Joseph—53, 277.

Cain—39, 81, 234.
Canaanites, slaughter of—237-239.
Canon, the Biblical—132, 133.
Care of Biblical writings—154.
Causality, argument from—175-177.
Cave men, the—166-167.
Cavillers—39.
Celsus—47-49, 160, 247, 252.
Christ and the Bible—64, 128, 131, 173, 174, 178; His wonderful person—96, 98, 102, 104; His claims—97-98; tributes to—99, 112; prophecies of—122, 125; predictions—125; witness to the Old Testament—124, 125, 128, 129, 140.
Christian consciousness, the—65-67.
Christian Theism—189-221.
Church fathers—155-158.
Clement of Rome—156; of Alexandria—158.
Codices, the ancient—152, 153.
Comfort, Christian—89, 90.
Confucianism—87, 94.
Conservatives—75, 76, 171.
Controversy—23.
Conversions, notable—143, 146.
Cosmological argument—192, 193.
Create (*barah*)—226, 230, 231.
Creation of the universe—225-229; of man—229-232.
Creeds, the ecumenical—50, 51.
Criticism, Biblical—5, 127, 128, 153, 169-175; definitions—169, 172; Higher and Lower—169; Legitimate—170; and scholarship—170, 171.
Cyprian—47.
Darling, C. D.—33.
Darwin and Darwinism—41, 57, 73, 185, 212.
Death, fear of cancelled—92-94.
Deists and deism—29, 53, 72, 86, 87, 126, 189, 190, 200, 201; noted advocates—53.
Deluge, the Noachian—162, 166, 234.
Delusion, Christian experience no—143-145.
Democritus—29, 71.
Design, argument from—193-194.

Deterioration—166, 167.
Difficulties, Biblical—39, 42; the skeptics—42, 222, 246.
Discrepancies, supposed in the Bible—241.
Divine existence, the, proofs of—190-197.
Dogmatism—26, 213.
Doubt, chief causes of—42-46, 253, 264; no sign of smartness—223; not good thing—223.
Doubters, how to treat them—33-35; kinds—36-41; their difficulties—222, 246.
Driver, S. R.—172.
Dualism—214.
Ebionites—47, 48.
Ebrard, H. H. A.—22, 259.
Eclecticism—72.
Edison, Thomas—28, 251.
Education and Christianity—147, 252, 254; and infidelity—253, 255.
Encyclopedism, French—53, 54, 249.
English and German rationalism—57, 58.
Epithets—6, 257.
Esthetic, argument—195, 196.
Ethics, Biblical—80-83, 103, 187, 189, 256, 258; infidel—255.
Evidence, Christian—22, 44, 67; internal—67, 75 77; external—134-188.
Exodus—127, 128.
Experience, Christian—59-61, 66, 67, 134-144; witness of the Spirit 134, 136, 137; must be Biblical—137-141; spiritual and sense compared—141, 142; unique—142, 143; no delusion—143, 145; factors—144.
External evidences—67, 75, 124-188.
Faith, Christian—29-31.
Fall of man—231-234.
Fathers, apostolic and church—155-158.
Finite God, doctrine of—87, 215, 216.
Fisher, G. P.—95, 117, 125, 160, 259, 276.
Fixity of type—211.
Fosdick, H. E.—60.
Frankness of Biblical writers—120-122.
French Encyclopedia—53, 54, 249.

French Institute—185.
Free-thinkers—38.
Garvie, A. E.—23, 24, 47.
General argument—192.
Genesis—127, 139, 161, 180, 183, 225-235.
Genuineness—74, 178-181.
German and English rationalism—57, 58, 126.
Gnostics—47, 86.
God, Biblical doctrine of—77, 78; proofs of His existence—190-197.
Haeckel, E.—71, 73, 206.
Hammurabi, Code of—163.
Heffern, A. D.—25.
Henslow, G.—41, 56, 57.
Heretics—23, 49, 50-52.
Hierocles—47, 49.
Hinduism—87, 93, 202.
Historical character of Biblical teaching—84, 85, 127, 143.
Historical sketch of Apologetics—57-61.
History, proofs from—150, 160.
Hittites, the—164.
Holy Spirit, the—34, 36; His witness—134, 136, 137.
Horne, Bishop—54, 255.
Hume, R. E.—80.
Hurst, J. F.—49, 50.
Huxley, Thomas—28.
Idealism—86, 199, 200, 214.
Inconsistent professing Christians—45, 46.
Infidels and infidelity—6, 23, 38, 46, 48, 56-58, 101, 148, 149, 160, 163, 211-214; their failure—247-257; their achievements—248-252.
Ingersoll, R. G.—101.
Inspiration, Biblical—77, 79, 80, 83, 85, 107, 120, 124-133; plenary—126; theories of—125, 126; Ryle and Wordsworth on—138; Driver on—172.
Integrity of the Bible—74, 177.
Internal evidences—67, 75, 77-133.
Irenaeus—47, 157.
Isaiah (53rd Chapter)—124.

James, William—87, 216.
Jews—47, 48, 52, 96.
Jonah—239, 240.
Josephus—159.
Justin Martyr—22, 47, 48, 143, 157.
Kant, Immanuel—29, 71.
Keith, A.—73.
Kellogg, S. H.—80, 83, 94, 147, 275.
Kelvin, Lord—28.
Kyle, M. G.—163, 164, 180, 274, 280.
Laidlaw, J.—79.
Lampooners—39.
Latitudinarians—41.
Liberalists—41, 171, 173, 213.
Lindberg, C. E.—47, 52, 259.
Lucian—47, 49, 160, 247.
Main proposition in Apologetics, the—62-67.
Man Biblical doctrine of—79; origin—139, 140, 165-167, 228, 229. his fall—232-234; infidel view of—254.
Manuscripts, Biblical—150-153; of other writers—151, 152.
Martyrs—149.
Materialism—86, 198, 199, 214, 249.
Mediating criticism—171-174.
Medieval period—51, 52.
Methodology—62-68.
Methods, others considered—64-68.
Mill, J. S.: 87, 99, 100, 216, 250.
Miracles—150, 152, 209, 211, 236, 238, 224-245.
Missionaries and their work—146.
Modernism—41, 58-61, 126, 127, 137.
Mohammedanism—93.
Monism—57, 214-215.
Monotheism—78, 168.
Moral argument—194, 195.
Moral teaching of the Bible (see Ethics).
Moses—163, 164, 178-181.
Muir, P. M.—56, 57.
Myths, legends, etc.—162, 173, 176.

Need of a special revelation—70, 71.
Nelson, David—33, 42, 263.
Nescience and nihilism—72, 73.
New Theology—41.
Nicaea, Council of—50.
Noah—81, 162, 166, 235.
Ontological argument—196, 197.
Origen—47, 49.
Orr, James—28, 79, 83, 110, 116, 180, 185, 260, 263, 266, 271, 273.
Outline, the general—7, 62.
Paine, Thomas—250, 252.
Paley, Wm.—53, 277.
Pantheism—86, 87, 201, 202, 214.
Papias—157.
Parallel and contrast—256, 257.
Patristics—155, 158.
Patton, F. L.—27.
Paul, his conversion—117-120; on inspiration—129, 130; his apostleship—137.
Pelagius—50.
Pentateuch, authorship of—178-181.
Persecution—35, 148-150, 176.
Pessimism—219-221.
Peter (Second, 1:12-21), analyzed—130, 131.
Pharaoh—237.
Philosophy—6, 28, 29, 47, 70-72, 86, 176, 187, 189, 200, 203, 204, 206, 218.
Pithom, city of—164.
Plato—29, 70, 71, 151.
Plenary inspiration—126.
Pliny—159, 160.
Pluralism—217-219.
Polemical period—49-51.
Polemics—23.
Polycarp—156, 157.
Porphyry—47, 49, 160, 247, 252.
Positivism—72, 203-205.
Possibility of a special divine revelation—70.
Probability of a special revelation—69.

Problems–27, 28.
Proofs, moral, cumulative, external, internal–74, 75; from history–150-160; of the divine existence–190-197.
Prophecy, its fulfillment–122, 125.
Psalms, the imprecatory–240, 241.
Psychology–87-95, 98f.
Ramsay, W. H.–164, 165, 181, 275.
Rationalists and rationalism–29, 32, 39-41, 54-56 (names given), 58, 126.
Rationalistic Press Association–41, 57.
Reason, right and wrong uses of–25-34; the regenerate person's –139-141.
Redemption, the plan of–82.
Red Sea, crossing of–236.
Regeneration–88, 89, 134, 135.
Relevancy to human need–87-95.
Religion–23, 151, 168.
Renan–100, 101.
Resurrection, Christ's–108-116; theories of–108-112; positive proofs of–112-116; His resurrection body–115, 116, 125.
Revelation, divine–29; the Bible a special–63-67, 72-188.
Ridicule–39, 40.
Rishell, C. W.–23, 27.
Ritschlianism–126.
Rousseau–53, 100, 101.
Salvation, Biblical doctrine of–79, 80.
Savanorola–52.
Schaff, Philip–48, 49, 83, 96, 101, 103, 151, 160.
Schmid, H.–32, 79, 92.
Scholarship–27, 32, 59, 60, 223.
Science–176; proofs from–182-215; love of–182; no conflict with the Bible–183-184; changes in theories–184, 185.
Scott, C. T.–25, 49.
Secularists–38, 39, 86.
Secular writers–159, 160.
Septuagint–153.
Sin, origin of–232-234; not animalism–233-234; why permitted–241, 242.
Sinai, Mount–152, 155.

Skeptical school (names given)—72.
Skeptics and skepticism—26, 27, 33-36, 38, 42-45, 72, 96, 99, 101.
Soberness of Biblical teaching—85.
Socrates—29.
Spinoza—29, 71, 202.
Spontaneous generation—209, 210.
Spurgeon, Charles—42, 143.
Substitutes for Christianity—72.
Syriac version—155.
Tacitus—159.
Talmud—153.
Targums—153.
Teleological argument—193, 194.
Tertullian—48, 158.
Testimony of fathers—155-158.
Textual criticism—169.
Theism, Christian—189-221; opposing theories—198-221; definitions—190.
Theopneustos—129.
Theosophy—72.
Timothy (Second, 3:16), analyzed—129, 130.
Tischendorf—152.
Traditional view—178.
Translations of the New Testament—154.
Transmutation of species—210.
Tributes to Christ (names given)—99-102.
Trumbull, H. C.—33.
Twice-born men—143, 252.
Unbelievers and unbelief—38, 42, 56-58.
Unique, Christian experience—142, 143.
Unity of Biblical teaching—83, 84.
Underwood, H. S.—80.
Urquhart, J.—54.
Virgin Birth of Christ, the—28, 60, 176.
Voltaire—49, 53, 54, 249, 252.
Watson, Bishop—22.
Wells, A. R.—111-113, 117, 118, 121, 125, 126, 147, 157, 158, 164, 181.
Wells, H. G.—87, 216, 218.
Westcott and Hort—87, 151, 152.

Whately, R.—53.
Why are we here?—73.
Witnesses, apostles and evangelists as—102-106; to Christ's resurrection—108-116; "cloud of"—142.
Woman and Christianity—147; creation of—221, 232.
World view, the Christian—185-188.
Wrongs done in the name of Christianity—148-150.